A VINDICATION OF THE ANSWER TO THE HUMBLE REMONSTRANCE FROM THE UNJUST IMPUTATION OF FRIVOLOUSNESSE AND FALSHOOD.

Wherein,

The cause of {LITURGY and EPISCOPACY} is further debated.

By the same

SMECTYMNUUS.

LONDON,
Printed for *John Rothwell* at the Fountaine and Beare in *Cheapside.*

TO THE
MOST HONORABLE
LORDS
AND THE
KNIGHTS, CITIZENS,
AND BVRGESSES OF
THE HONORABLE HOVSE
OF COMMONS.

IT was the expectation that the whole Kingdome had of your high worth, and faithfull resolutions, to reforme what was amisse both in Church and State, which gave us the confidence to present unto you our former treatise. And now your reall performance, and noble Actions tending to the publicke peace and good, have added much more chearefulnesse in our second addresse towards you; the rather, for that the cause in que-

stion betweene us and the Remonstrant, about Episcopacy *and* Liturgie, *is a great part of that worke to which God hath directed your present consultations. Seeing therefore it belongs to you next under God and his Majestie, to dispose and order these things: Wee leave our endeavours at your feete, beseeching you to consider, not onely how we have vindicated our selves from the accusations of our adversarie, but more especially what may bee gathered out of it for the advancement of the reformation now happily begunne among us. The Lord of life and glory bee a Sunne and shield unto you.*

TO

TO THE READER.

Good Reader,

THE Booke which we here undertake to answer, is so full fraught with bitter invectives, false aspertions, hyperbolicall confidence, selfe contradictions, and such like extravagancies, as that we have thought fit to lay them all before thee in one full view by way of preface, rather then to interrupt our following discourse by observing them as they lie scattered in the booke it selfe. Suffer us therefore to give thee notice of these few particulars.

First, wee are deepely charged and accused not onely to the ordinarie Reader but even to the Kings Majestie himself, of *misallegations, misinterpretations, mistranslations, and false quotations*, and that in such an high nature as that the Authour *calles God to witnesse, before whom he is shortly to give an account that hee never saw any Author that would dare to professe Christian*

Chriſtian ſincerity ſo fowle to overlaſh. And this is not once or twice but often repeated with great aſſeveration & exclamations. Which when we firſt reade (being conſcious of our innocency and fidelity) we could not but ſtand amazed and wonder to ſee our ſelves ſo unexpectedly and wee hope undeſervedly transformed into men (or rather monſters of men) ſo tranſcendently perfidious, and ſo ſuperſuperlatively unfaithfull and wicked. And indeede, if to be accuſed of a fault bee a ſufficient argument to make us guilty, wee muſt needes bee for ever branded with ſuch an high meaſure of ignominy, as that it is not a whole ſea of water that will ſerve to waſh off the filth of ſuch accuſations. But wee doubt not but that the ingenuous peruſer of this booke will finde that as it was the glory of one of the *Cato's* that hee was thirty times accuſed and yet never found guiltie; ſo it will be our honour and credit when hee ſhall ſee that all this clamour and noyſe is but a bearing of falſewitneſſe againſt his brethren. *Si accuſaſſe ſat eſt quis erit innocens.* It was the the wicked counſell of *Matchiavell Calumniare fortiter & aliquid adhærebit.* This counſell the Papiſts have made uſe of in anſwering of Proteſtant writers, and the Biſhops themſelves in their anſwers to ſome of the unconforming Miniſters bookes. And we have good reaſon to thinke that the Authour of this *Defence* hath trod in the ſame ſteps. For after all his generall exclamations and accuſations, there are but foure places in which hee undertakes to prove us falſe. The firſt is for halfe citing of *Hieroms teſtimonie.* The ſecond

is

is for *abuſing Nazianzene*. The third is for *miſinterpreting Origen about Lay Elders*. The fourth is for *foyſting in Cyprian*. True it is, hee tells us of *want of fidelity in citing the Counſell of Antioch* and *Ancyra*, of miſalledging of *Whitakers*, of miſengliſhing *Tertullian*, and of guilty tranſlating of *Juſtin Martyr*. But hee doth not ſo much as endeavour to make good what he tells us, and therefore we cannot but beleeve that hee uſed more *Machiaveliſme* then honeſty in ſuch aſperſions. As for Authors which hee himſelfe hath both miſalledged and miſinterpreted, wee doe not onely ſay it, but the Reader ſhall finde it demonſtratively proved in the enſuring treatiſe.

Secondly, if to be railed upon, reviled, ſlighted, and ſcorned bee ſufficient to bring men into diſcredit, then certainely, we muſt be eſteemed as περικαθαρμα, περιψημα τοῦ κοσμου, as *the dung, of ſcouring, and filth of the world*. For never man ſince *Monntagues Appeale*, wrote with more ſcorne and contempt. Wee are ca led *Vaine, frivolous, Cavillers, inſolent, ſpightfull, riotous, proud, falſe, unjuſt, triflers, factious, Brotherly ſlanderers, ſullen and crabbed peices, Lyars, egregious and palpable calumniators, wilfully ſhutting our eyes againſt the truth, ſuch as the Readers may be aſhamed off, witleſſe, malicious, uncharitable, envious, frivolous waſters of unſeaſonable words, ſwelling up a windy bulke with groundleſſe exceptions againſt our eyes and conſcience, tedious and looſe diſputers, Patronizers of branded Heretiques,*

impotent, weake, and absurd men, grosselyignorant, such as fowly over-reach, men of weake judgement, and strong malice; commonly spightfull, *and seldome witty, violent and subtile machinators against, and disturbers of Gods ordinances, some whole sections meere declamations, worthy of nothing but of contempt and silence, ill bred sons of the Church, spitting in the face of our Mother, fomentors of unjust dislikes against lawfull goverment, making wickedly false suggestions, wanting witt and grace to understand the true meaning of the* Jus Divinum *of Episcopacy*, worthy to be punished for their presumption, & disobedience, *men that make no conscience by what meanes wee uphold a side and winne a Proselyte.* These are the flowers with which his defence is garnished, and the titles with which he honours those whom hee calles his Brethren. Wee will make no other Apologie for our selves, but what *Austin* did in the same kind, who when hee was told that his railing adversarie was to hard for him, hee said it was an easie thing that way to conquer *Austin*, but the Reader should perceive it was *Clamore* not *veritate*, by loud crying not by truth: And what *Hierom* saith against *Helvidius*, *Arbitror te veritate convictum a maledicta converti.* It is a signe of a man not able to stand before the truth, when hee betakes himselfe to reproachfull language.

Thirdly, if multitude of *daring protestations* and bold *asseverations* be sufficient proofes of arguments

guments propounded, and if *confident ſlightings*, and *ſcornefull denyalls* bee ſufficient anſwers to us, and our arguments, never any man hath better defended Epiſcopacie or more ſtrongly confuted thoſe that oppoſe it. In his very firſt page hee begges the queſtion, and affirmes his cauſe to bee *Gods cauſe, Gods truth*, and *if his oppoſers were as many Legions as men, hee would meet them undiſmayed, and ſay with holy David; Though an hoſt ſhould encampe againſt mee, my heart ſhould not feare, but with juſt confidence & gladly fly to the barre of this high and Honorable Court*, (And yet by his leave hee thought it his beſt wiſdome to fly from this barre, and to dedicate his book to the Kings Majeſtie alone, and not to the two houſes:) And in another place hee ſaith, *the Apoſtles practiſe is ſo irrefragable for them, that if wee doe but adde the unqueſtionable practiſe of their immediate ſucceſſors: hee knowes not what more light can bee deſired for the manifeſtation of the truth of his opinion.* In his Epiſtle to the King hee ſaith, *That if hee doth not make it appeare that wee have abuſed our Reader with falſe ſhewes of miſalleadged antiquities, and meerely colourable pretences of proofes, let the blemiſh of his reputation leade way to the ſharpeſt cenſure upon his perſon.* (Iuſt like the Authour of *Epiſcopacie by Divine right*, who is ſo confident againſt Lay Elders; That hee offers to forfeit his life to juſtice, and his reputation to ſhame, if any man living can ſhew

that ever there was a Ruling Elder in the world till *Farel* and *Viret* first created them: (And yet hee could not but know that Arch-Bishop *Whitgift* (as well seene in Antiquitie as himselfe) confesseth that there were Ruling Elders in the Primitive Church. Thus also doth Bishop *King*; *Saravia* himselfe thinkes the government of Ruling Elders to be good and profitable.) In his answer to our arguments, sometimes hee tells us that *wee prove nothing but our bold ignorance and absurd inconsequences*: Otherwhile hee saith, *Poore arguments scarce worthy of a passe. These are trifling cavills not worth the answer. Verball exceptions which will sinke like light froath. Meere declamations worthie of no answer but contempt and scorne. forbeare Reader, if you can to smile at this curious subtilty: What Cabalisme have wee here? Our queries are made up of nothing but spight and slander.* His ordinarie answer toour Testimonies out of Antiquity is: *This Authour is misalledged. That Father abused. This Councell shuffled up with little fidelitie. Away with your unproving illustrations and unregardable testimonies.* And this is all the answer hee gives. Throughout the whole booke he endeavours to render us to the Reader as destitute of all learning, as if our reading had never gone beyond a *Polyanthea*. Hee calles us *boldly ignorant*. And *that wee would make the Reader beleeve that wee had seene a Father*. And *that we would seeme to have seene the Canon Law*. And

that

that it is enough wee can shew a little reading to no purpose. But in all theſe and many more ſuch like Sarcaſmes and vaine Rhetorications hee doth but act the part of his Hierarchicall predeceſſors whoſe chiefe anſwers have beene ſcoffes and ſcornes; and therefore what learned *Rivetus* ſaith of Biſhop *Mountague* may with as much truth bee averred of this nameleſſe Author. *Montacutius vir certe doctus, ſed admodum præſidens, & tumidus aliorum contemptor, & ſuggillator.* And in another place. *Non poteſt vir ille ſine convitijs quemquam a quo diſſentit vel in leviſsimis nominare.* But what ſtrength and weight there is in ſuch kinde of arguments and anſwers, let the wiſe Reader judge. *Apol. pro Sancta Mania. pag. 77. 95.*

And yet not withſtanding all this confidence & Thraſonicall boaſting we deſire thee to obſerve:

Fourthly, That if the whole booke were divided into foure parts, there is one quarter of which he makes no mention, but paſſeth it over either with ſcorne or ſilence. And where our arguments are ſtrongeſt there hee ſlides away without anſwering, which cannot but make the judicious Reader beleeve that *hee thought the yron to hot for him, and therefore would not touch it leaſt it ſhould burne his owne fingers*; as himſelfe ſaith *pag.* 21. And even in thoſe things wherein hee undertakes to anſwere us we cannot but give notice that wee have *confitentem reum*, and in effect the cauſe granted in thoſe things which are moſt

moſt materiall. For when wee prove from Scripture the Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters both in name and office, he tells us with a little varying of our words; *Wee idly looſe our labour. It neede bee no ſcruple to us: It is in expreſſe termes granted,* when we prove that there are not three degrees of Miniſtery in the Scripture (to wit, Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons) hee anſwers, *it is granted; you ſpeake of the Apoſtles writings, but I of their ſucceſſors.* Hee granteth alſo *that the Primitive Bishops were elected by the Clergie, and people. That Bishops ought not to have ſole power in Ordination, and Juriſdiction. That they ought not to delegate their power to others. That the ordinary managing of ſecular imployments is improper for them.* And hee doth almoſt grant that there were Lay-Elders in antiquity. For whereas the Author of Epiſcopacy by Divine right affirmeth, that the name of Elders of the Church in all antiquity comprehendeth none but Preachers, and that therefore they onely may bee called *Seniores Eccleſiæ*, though ſome others may have the title of *Seniores populi*, becauſe of their civill aurhority. This Author acknowledgeth that beſides Paſtors, and beſides the Magiſtrates and Elders of the City there are to bee found in antiquity *Seniores Eccleſiaſtici*. Indeede hee ſaith, that theſe were but as our *Churchwardens*, or *Veſtry men*. But how true this is, the Reader ſhall ſee in due place: Laſtly, hee grants that *all that wee*

ſay

ſay in the Poſtſcripts about the Popiſh Prelates is true. Celari non potuit negari non debuit. And for what we ſay of the Proteſtant Biſhops he denies not the truth of it only he chides for taxing all for the fault of ſome.

And in theſe things wherein hee doth diametrically oppoſe us, hee doth frequently contradict himſelfe and his beſt friends. In his Epiſtle dedicatory hee profeſſeth that he *taxeth not our ability*, yet in the ſame Epiſtle hee calles us *impotent aſſailants*, and afterwards. *Men of weake judgements and ſtrong malice.* And *Men that would ſeeme to have ſeene a Father.* And that *all that we ſay is nothing but bold ignorance. Pag.* 94. he ſaith, *That to acknowledge an Ordinary Evangeliſt is a phancy and a dreame.* And yet elſewhere *he makes every Preacher of the Goſpell to be an Evangeliſt.* In his Remonſtrant and in his defence he ſaith, that *Biſhops had beene every where throughout all the Regions of the Chriſtian world. And that all Churches throughout the whole Chriſtian world have uniformely and conſtantly maintained Epiſcopacy.* And yet elſewhere he denies that ever hee ſaid, *That Biſhops were every where*, and confeſſeth *that there are leſſe noble Churches that doe not conferre to Epiſcopall Governement. Pag.* 161. hee tells us, that *for* 1600 *yeares the name of Biſhops hath bin appropriated (in a plain contradiſtinction) to the governors of the Church*: But in other places he often grants that the *Name* was confounded, and aſcribed to *Presbyters* are well as *Biſhops.* In his 36. *pag.* he ſaith, *That in his Remonſtrance hee made no mention of Dioceſan Biſhops*, whereas all know that he undertooke the defence of ſuch Biſhops which were petitioned againſt

gainſt in Parliament, whom none will deny to bee Dioceſan Biſhops. In his 5. *pag.* (ſpeaking of the changing of Civill governement mentioned in the Remonſtrance) *he profeſſeth that he did not aime at our Civill Governement.* Let but the Reader ſurvey the words of the Remonſtance *pag.* 8. and it will appeare plainely *ac ſi ſolaribus radijs deſcriptum eſſet.* That the compariſon was purpoſely made betwixt the attempts of them that would have altered our Civill governement, and thoſe that indeavored the alteration of our Church governement. And whereas he bids as *pag.* 135. *to take our ſole ordination and ſole juriſdiction to ſole our next paire of ſhoes withall*, yet notwithſtanding hee makes it his great worke to anſwer all our arguments againſt the ſole power of Biſhops, and when all is done, allowes the Presbyter onely *an aſſiſtance*, but *no power* in Ordination nor juriſdiction. Laſtly, in the ſtating of the queſtion he diſtinguiſheth *betweene divine and Apoſtolicall authority*, and denyeth that Biſhops are of Divine authority as ordained immediately by Chriſt. And yet he ſaith, *That Chriſt himſelfe hath laid the ground of this imparitie in his firſt agents. And that by the evidence of Timothy and Titus, and the Aſian Angels (to whom Chriſt himſelfe wrote) he hath made good that juſt claime of the ſacred Hierarchy.*

This is the ſumme of that (good Reader) that we thought fit to præmoniſh thee of. Wee now diſmiſſe thee to the booke it ſelfe, and com ner d thee and it, to the bleſſing of God.

A Vindication of the ANSWER to the humble *Remonſtrance.*

Sect. I.

IF wee thought our ſilence would onely prejudice our ſelves, wee could contentedly ſit downe and forbeare Replyes, not doubting, but intelligent men, comparing cauſe with cauſe, and reaſon with reaſon, would eaſily ſee with whom the truth reſts: but wee fearing that many who have not either ability or leiſure to ſearch into the grounds of things themſelves,

would ſcarce thinke it poſſible, that ſo much confidence as the *Remonſtrant* ſhewes, ſhould be ſevered from a good cauſe, or ſo much contempt ſhould bee powred upon us that are not the bad defenders of a cauſe much worſe. Wee muſt diſcharge our duty in cleering the cauſe and truth of God, and that will cleer us from all the foule aſperſions which the *Remonſtrant* hath been nothing ſparing to caſt upon us. Whoſe *Defence* in every Leafe terms us either *ignorant, lyers, witleſſe, falſifiers, malicious, ſpighfull, ſlanderous, violent*, and *ſubtill Machinators againſt the Church, and diſturbers of her peace*, &c. and this not onely in a curſory way, but in ſuch a devout and religious form, as we make queſtion whether ever any man before him did ſo ſolemnly traduce, *ſpeaking it in the preſence of God, that he never ſaw any Writer profeſſing Chriſtian ſincerity ſo foulyto overlaſh.* To the preſence of God before whom his proteſtation is made, our acceſſe is equall, and at that Tribunall wee doubt not, through the grace of Chriſt, but to approve both our ſelves & our cauſe. And had we the ſame acceſſe unto our Sovereigne, wee ſhould leſſe regard thoſe bitter invective accuſations, wherewith hee hath ſo profuſely charged us in his *Sacred* eares.

Pag. 163.

But our meaneſſe forbids us to make immediate addreſſes to the throne, which he hath made his refuge: yet may it pleaſe that *Royall Majeſty*, whom God hath anointed over us, to vouchſafe an eye unto theſe papers, wee have that truſt in the Juſtice of our *Sovereigne*, the goodneſſe of our Cauſe, the integrity of our conſciences in all our Quotations, as we doubt not but his *Majeſty* will cleerly ſee, that our

Per-

Perſons, cauſe, and carriage, have been miſrepreſented to him.

The cauſe our *Remonſtrant* ſaith *is Gods*; it is true of the *cauſe* agitated, though not of the *cauſe* by him defended: and we deſire (what ever he hath done) to manage it in Gods way; *to love in the truth, and ſpeak the truth in love.*

The charity of our *Remonſtrant* wee will not queſtion, though in the firſt congreſſe hee doth as good as call us *Devils*: becauſe ſo often in his book he cals us *Brethren*. But that which hee calls *truth*, and the *truth of God*, we muſt crave leave to doe more, then bring in queſtion, notwithſtanding the impregnable confidence of this *Irrefragable Doctor*.

Our Hiſtories record of *Harold*, Cupbearer to *Edward* the *Confeſſor*, that wayting on the Cup, he ſtumbled with one foot, and almoſt fell, but that hee recovered himſelf with the other; at which his father ſmiling ſaid, *Now one brother helps another*. The *Remonſtrant* calls us *Brethren*, and ſuppoſeth hee ſees us ſtumbling in the very entrance of our anſwer, and what help doth our *Brother* lend us? Onely entertains us *Sannis & Cachinnis*, and tels us, *it is an ill ſigne to ſtumble at the threſhold*. Yet not alwayes an ill ſigne Sir, wee accept this ſtumbling for ſuch an *Omen*, as *Cæſar* had at his Landing in *Affrick*, and our *William* the Conquerour at his firſt landing in *England*, which they tooke for the firſt ſigne of their victory and poſſeſſion.

And what's this Stumble? The Anſwer mentions the *Areopagi* inſtead of the *Areopagites*, *Grande nefas*! Of ſuch an impiety as this, did *Duræus* once

accuse our Learned *Whitakers*, from whom wee will in part borrow our answer: *It is well the good of the Church depends not upon a piece of Latine.*

Bene habet his in rebus non verantur fortunæ Ecclesiæ.

But can our *Remonstrant* perswade himselfe, that his Answerers should have so much *Clarklike ignorance*, as never to have heard of *Areopagita*? If he can, yet we are sure he can never perswade his ingenious Readers, but some one at least of that *Legion*, which hee fancies conjured up against his *Remonstrance*, might have heard of *Dionysius Areopagita*, that by a man that had not studied to cast contempt upon us, it might have beene thought rather a stumble in the Transcribers or Printers, then the Authours.

But what if there be no stumble here? What if the fault be in the *Remonstrants* eyes, and not in the Answerers words? What if hee stumble and not they? and what if it be but a straw he stumbles at? For though *Areopagus* be the name of the place, and *Areopagitæ* the name of the persons; yet it is no such impropriety in speech, to signifie the persons by the place: had wee said the *Admired sonnes* of *Iustice*, the two Houses of *Parliament*, had this been such a Solœcisme? and will this *Remonstrant* deny us that liberty, for which we have Natures Patent, and the example of the best Authors in other Tongues, To smooth, or square, to lengthen, or cut off Exoticke words, according as will best suit with our own Dialect? If we were called to give an account of this Syllabicall Errour before a Deske of Grammarians, wee could with ease produce presidents enough in approved Authors: but we will onely give an instance in the word it self from *Joan. Sarisburi. lib. 5.*

de

de Nugis Curialibus, cap. 9. Eum [Senatum] *vero Athenienſes* Areopagum *dicebant eo quod in illis totius populi virtus conſiſteret.*

We hope our Remonſtrant hath now recovered his *ſtumble*, and next we find him leaping, being as good at leaping over blocks, as hee is at ſtumbling at ſtraws: it is his practice through his whole booke, what ever objection made by us, he finds too heavy to remove, he over-leaps it.

This courſe hee begins here, for wee having charged him with ſome words ſounding to contempt in his *Preface*, he falls a quarrellling with our *Logick*, for calling that a *Preface*, *which hee intended as one of the main pieces of the ſubſtance of his book*. Which certainly, if *Captatio Benevolentiæ* be the work of a Preface, he that reads the *Remonſtrance* to the ninth page, will find that the preceding pages have been but by way of inſinuation; and there he comes to the propoſition and narration of his cauſe.

But if our *Logick* was bad, hee knew his *Ethicks* were worſe: and therefore theſe miſdemeanours which we juſtly charged upon him, and he knew not how to excuſe or anſwer, his *Politicks* taught him to leap over. Counting all to the fourth page, *as light froth that will ſink alone*; which ſeems to us a ſtrange piece of Phyſik; and if we would cry quit with the *Remonſtrant*, & make our Reader as merry with him, as he would make his Readers with us, wee could tell him a Tale in the margent *. But ſome thing it

* A Gentleman ſtudent in Philoſophy, that was by chance preſent at the reading of this *paſſage*, tooke ſuch a fancy to this rare myſtery of *light froath*, ſinking aloan, that he would take no nay, till he had entreated us to obtain ſo much of the *Remonſtrant*, as to publiſh his receit of making *light froath ſinke alone*, that it may be added to the *Secrets* of *Alexis*, or the rare experiments of *Baptiſta Porta*.

ſeems

seems is of a little more solid substance, it is as *scum* that will not so easily sink alone; wherein you appeal to *indifferent eyes to judge whether we do not endevour to cast unjust envy upon you against the cleer evidence of any knowing mans conscience.* Content. Onely put the case right: you tell your Judges that you had said, *That if Antiquity may be the rule, the Civill policie (as in generall notion) hath sometimes varied, the Sacred never; the Civill came from Arbitrary Imposers, the Sacred from men inspired: now these gracious Interpreters would draw your words to the present and particular government of our own Monarchie, as if you implied that variable and arbitrary; and are not ashamed to mention that deadly name of Treason.* Our charge upon this is, that in the judgement of this *Remonstrant*, if any had dared to attempt the alteration of *Monarchicall* Government, they had been lesse culpable then in petitioning the alteration of *Episcopall*, and conclude, that if he had found such a passage in any of those whom he cals *lewd Libellers*, all had rung with *Treason, Treason.*

Now let the indifferent *Reader*, let the most Honourable *Parliament*, let the *Sacred Majesty* of our King Judge whether we doe the man wrong. First, this we know, that one of the most confident Advocates of *Episcopacie* hath said it, that *where a Nationall Church is setled in the orderly regiment of certain grave Overseers, to seek to abandon this forme, and to bring in a forreigne Discipline, is as unreasonable as to cast off the yoke of just and hereditary Monarchy, and to affect many headed Soveraignty*: which wee thinke is an assertion insolent enough, that sets the *Mitre* as high as the *Crowne*: *God blesse our sacred Monarchie from such friends.*

Episcop. Divine Right. part. 1. pag. 25.

But

But this *Remonſtrant* riſes higher, and ſets the Mitre above the Crown. Telling us, that *Civill Government comes from Arbitrarie Impoſers, this from men inſpired*, and is in that reſpect by the *Remonſtrant* challenged to be of *divine right*. If *Civill Government* here include *Monarchie*, as by the *Remonſtrants* owne explication it doth, certainly this is to advance *Epiſcopacie* above *Monarchie*, and to make it more ſinfull and dangerous to alter Epiſcopacy, which, according to the *Remonſtrant*, challenges God for the founder, then *Monarchie*, which ſaith this *Remonſtrant* according to originall Authority had its foundation in the free Arbitrement of men.

Yet did we never ſay that this was *Treaſon*; knowing ſuch crimes to be above our cognizance; wee mentioned indeed the name of Treaſon, but as from your mouth, not our own. We ſaid, *If you had found any ſuch in any*, &c. *the world would have rung with the loud eryes of treaſon, treaſon*: it was our conjecture which you have now made good in this defence, For you that are ſo full of charity to impute it to us, as if that wee had vilified the judgement of King *James*, as you do pag. 23. whom we mentioned not, but as a moſt famous, and ever admired Prince, had any word faln from us (which through the grace of God we hope never ſhall) tending to the diſparagement either of the Royall Perſon or power, What work would you have made with that? Be ſparing, Sir, of charging your poore Neighbours ſo impetuouſly with malice and uncharitableneſſe, till yee have taught your ſelfe to be more charitable, and leſſe malicious.

To

To what wee alleaged in the instance of *William Rufus* King, and Pope *Pius*, to shew that Episcopall Government, which he calls sacred, naturally tends not onely not to depend upon, but to subdue the civill authority to it selfe; His answer is, first, That *William* Rufus was a Prince noted for *grosly irreligious. That those were tyrannicall Popish Bishops.* That the *Pope was Antichrist.* That he *answered so because hee was unwilling they should shew as good cards for their standing as hee pretended for his own.* And lastly, *all this makes nothing against our Bishops, who professe, notwithstanding the divine right of their calling, to hold their places, and the exercise of their jurisdiction wholly from the King.*

So then here is no Falsification: all that was produced is granted true, onely exception taken against the persons produced. King *William* hee was *irreligious. Daniel* observes that former times being unhappy in their compilers of History (the Scepter which rules over the fames of Princes) who for the most part were Monks, had all their Princes personated either Religious or irreligious as they humoured or offended the *Bishops* Rochet, and the *Monks belly.* No wonder then if so small a friend to Bishops be condemned as irreligious.

But then those Bishops were Popish, Tyrannous Bishops. But it was not their Popery, but their Episcopall dignity that made them tyrannize; and it was their Tyranny and not their Popery that made them odious to their King, who was Popish as well as they. And it hath beene ever usuall to both former and latter Bishops to tyrannize over such as feare them, and to flatter such as they feare.

The

The Pope hee is *Antichriſt*; wee are glad to heare you call him ſo; ſome thought a yeere agoe you would ſcarce have given him ſuch a nickname, unleſſe you meant to have falne out with the reſt of your brethren: and what if the Pope be Antichriſt? may wee not bring the teſtimony of Antichriſt againſt Antichriſtian Biſhops? As *Paul* brought the witneſſe of a *Cretian Poet*, againſt *Cretian* Liers. May not we alleage *Beelzebub* againſt *Beliall* without honouring him?

But the Pope ſo anſwered becauſe *he was unwilling they ſhould ſhew as good cards for their ſtanding as he pretends for his own*; grant it ſo, what will follow upon that but this? That Biſhops clayming the ſame grounds for their ſtanding that the Pope doth, aſpire to be as independant from Princes as the Pope is, and that they have no more Divine Right, then the Pope: *But whats this to our Biſhops who profeſſe, notwithſtanding their Divine Right, to hold their places, and exerciſe of Juriſdiction wholly from the King?* Surely ours have begun to affect the ſame Exemption from Secular power, to make large and haughty ſtrides towards an independant *Hierarchie*. So that it is no *envious upbraid* to parallell ours with the former *Biſhops*. For it hath well appeared that the *Hierarchicall Epiſcopacie* is full of ſuch high and large principles of Pride, Ambition, Tyranny, as can be circumſcribed in no moderate bounds: But is always ſwelling to the affectation of an Abſolute Eccleſiaſticall Monarchie. And it is worth the enquiring, whether the three laſt books of *Hookers Eccleſiaſticall Politie* be not ſuppreſſed by him

that hath them, becauſe they give the Prince too much power in Eccleſiaſticall matters, and are not for the Divine Right of Biſhops.

But we ſhall be chid anon, and accuſed of *ſpight* for this, as wee are for the obſervation formerly made upon his compariſon between the attempts of Alteration in our Neighbour Church by the Epiſcopall faction, and that which is now juſtly deſired by the humble Petitioners to this Honourable Houſe. This ſaith the Remonſtrant, *is a foule ſlander to charge the name of Epiſcopacie* with a *Faction For a fact imputed to ſome few.* Were they but a few that did attempt and *proſecute* that *alteration?* the more is our miſery, that a few Biſhops can put both Kingdomes into ſo dangerous a combuſtion, what ſtirre would they all make if they ſhould unite their powers? And were they but a few that were the Factors for that Attempt? how then was it that one of the Epiſcopall Tribe in publike Court called the *Scotch* deſigne *Bellum Epiſcopale?* and where were the reſt of the peaceable Orthodox Biſhops the while? that might in love to peace & truth have oppoſed thoſe bold attempts, & not have ſuffered a *few*, upon whom you now leave the guilt of faction, to expoſe the deare and precious name of *Epiſcopacie* to that obloquie.

Let the Remonſtrant never cry fie upon his *brethren*, that dare challenge *Epiſcopacie* of *Faction*: but fie upon his *Fathers* the *biſhops*, that have ſubjected it to that challenge: had *biſhops* done ſo in *Cyprians* time, we doubt not but there would have bin fonnd *Presbyters* who would have ſaid as much, and need never

never have feared Gaoles nor Pillories, nor high Commiſsions, the holy Diſcipline wherewith the *Fathers of the ſacred Hierarchie* have of late yeers viſited ſuch offences.

SECT. II.

WEE are in this and the following Sections not to contend for words, but things, things precious to the Remonſtrant, *Liturgie*, and *Epiſcopacie*, for which he fights, *tanquam pro aris & focis.*

The ſubject of this Section is the Liturgie, where firſt he fals upon us for the *Alterations*, and *Additions*, mentioned by us, which hee calls ſuch an *envious and groundleſſe ſuggeſtion as muſt needs cover our faces with a bluſh.* Truly, Sir, If we were able to produce no fuller evidence of this then you have done of your *Jewiſh* Liturgie ever ſince *Moſes time*, we ſhould bluſh indeed; but if wee can bring forth inſtances of ſuch Alterations as ſhall prove this preſent Liturgie to be none of that, which hath beene confirmed by *Parliamentary Acts*; keep your *bluſhes* to make Liveries for your ſelf and friends.

The Liturgie confirmed by our Parliamentary Acts is the ſame which was made and confirmed in the fifth and ſixth of *Edward* the ſixth, with *one alteration, and additions of certaine Leſſons to be uſed upon every Sunday; and the forme of the Letany altered and*

amended, and two sentences onely added in the delivery of the Sacrament: *And none other or otherwise.* But this booke is so altered from that, that in it is left out,

First a clause in the Letany, *From the tyranny of the Bishop of* Rome, *and all his detestable enormities, good Lord deliver us, &c.* 32. Chapters of the Old Testament, a Prayer against death, a Rubrick, or declaration of the manner of the presence of Christs body and bloud in the Sacrament. Besides some other things of lesse moment.

Secondly, added 26 Apocryphall Chapters, more to be read 47 Proper Lessons, The Prayers for Bishops and Curats, many Collects after the Communion, A Rubrick in the examination of private Baptisme. In the Calendar Fish dayes are now called Fasting days. A Catalogue of Holidays.

Thirdly, many things changed; in the title of Confirmation, the words for imposition of hands are added. In the Epistle for Palm-sunday, in the Name of Jesus, turned into, at the Name of Jesus, besides such *smaller alterations*, which himselfe acknowledges. These are sufficient to evince that the Liturgie now in use is not that Liturgie that was established by Act of Parliament, and therefore that Act binds not to the use of this Liturgie, as we conceive. Now if to these we should adde the late alterations in the use of the Liturgie, Bringing in loud Musique, uncouth and unedifying Anthems, a pompous, superstitious Altar-service, wee thinke any indifferent eye will say this is not the Liturgie established by Parliament: wee hope that these alterations are so visible, as any, that will not fully

shut

ſhut their eys, will ſay it is with this miſaltered Liturgie as with the diſguiſed Dames mentioned of old by Doctor *Hall.*

And we hope, nay we know wee have ſome Biſhops of our minde in this, as well as you have ſome of yours; & how ever you ſlight the words of one of them, not inferiour to any of them that wee know, with an *effutit labiis*: yet it is a ſubtile ſhift you have to pervert the Biſhops words. For whereas hee ſaid that the *Service of the Church of* England *was now ſo dreſt, that if the Pope ſhould come and ſee it, he would claim it as his own, but that it is in Engliſh*, The Remonſtrant would ſeeme to underſtand by this onely ſuch *an inoffenſivenesſe, in the devotion of it, as the Pope himſelf could find no fault in it*: whereas the Biſhop meant ſuch a ſymmetry and correſpondency of our preſent devotion and ſervice with the Popiſh, as was in his eſteem juſt matter of Humiliation to al the Biſhops in the Kingdom, in a day of ſolemn & national Faſting.

Inſtead of bringing out thoſe great applauſes, that forreigne Divines and Churches have given to our Liturgie, hee falls (though more gently then hee is wont) upon Maſter *Calvin* for his *Tolerabiles ineptiæ*, as if that hee did ἀλλοτειοεπισκοπεῖν. It ſeemes the Remonſtrant did not either conſider the occaſion of that Cenſure, or elſe his *not Omniſcient eyes* never ſaw the Epiſtle that the Learned *Calvin* wrote to the diſperſed at *Frankfort*, which would tell him that the occaſion of this Cenſure was the troubles raiſed up among the Engliſh Exiles then at *Frankford*, about the booke of Liturgie (which was then as ſince a ſpring of unhappy contentions in the Church) hereupon

upon he writes a Letter to them, wherein hee uſeth that phraſe of *tolerable fooleries*: and in a Chriſtian way perſwades both diſagreeing ſides to accord: which he puts not upon them by way of authority, but Chriſtian adviſe: nay, he ſays more, that theſe fooleries were tolerable then, yet he doubted not if Religion flouriſhed in *England*, many of theſe would be removed, and other things amended: and though they might begin with ſuch weak rudiments, yet it was behovefull for the grave and pious Miniſters of Chriſt to riſe to a higher pitch, &c. So that here Maſter *Calvin* did not unwarrantably intrude *in alienam rempublicam*: Nor did any other then would become any of our grave and learned Divines, in the caſe of the *Wafers*, *or Lords Day Markets* of his Charge, if called unto that ſervice, as Maſter *Calvin* was to this.

The Remonſtrant leads us from the *Engliſh Liturgie*, to a Diſcourſe of Liturgies in generall: which wee call *unparalleld*, becauſe no man that ever wee have ſeene drew the line of Liturgie ſo high as hee hath done, even as high as *Moſes* time; to which his anſwer is, *Perhaps there are ſome things our not omniſcient eyes have not ſeene, and perhaps this may be one of them*: and perhaps there are ſome things which hee hath confidently avouched that his *Lincean eys* have not ſeen, and perhaps this is one of them; or elſe we ſhould ſee it too. But that needs not ſaith the Remonſtrant for *wee almoſt yield the queſtion before wee argue it*: the happier man hee to obain that by conceſsion that hee never could by argumentation: but how doe wee *yield the queſtion*? in granting

graning an order of divine administrations observed in Church Assemblies, but denying an imposition of set forms. Iust. Mart. Apolog 2.

We find in antiquity, that when the Church met together upon the Lords day, first the Scriptures were read of the old and new Testament, after the reading followed an Exhortation to the practice and imitation of what was read, then they all rose and joyned in Prayer: Prayer being ended, they went to the Sacrament, in the beginning whereof the President of the Assembly powred out Prayers and Thanksgiving according to his ability, and the people said *Amen*; then followed the distribution of the Sacrament: After that the collection of Almes, &c. this was *Justine Martyrs* Liturgie. Will you now see *Tertullians?*

Tertull. Apol. cap. 39.

First, the Congregation meets, and doe as it were besiege God with their prayers, wherein they pray for the Emperors, for their servāts, officers, &c. then they went to repeating the Scriptures according to the time and occasion, then they edified themselves in faith and hope by holy exhortations. There they had also the exercise of Discipline, there they had their Love-feasts which began and ended with prayers, and were celebrated with singing of Psalmes. This was *Tertullians* Liturgie. From these two Writers of the purest times, it is evident that it was the custome or order of the Church in their Assemblies to pray, read, and expound the Scriptures, administer the Sacraments; but that there were set formes of Prayer prescribed and inposed upon the προέδρους, that they were tyed to read such and such Scriptures, that the προέδρους had words of exhortation

tion put into his mouth, that hee must use without adding, or altering, or diminishing, all which are in a stinted Liturgy, this doth not appear, but rather the contrary, *Tertullian* saith, *Coimus ad sacrarum literarum commemorationem si quid præsentium temporum qualitas aut præmonere cogit aut recognoscere.*

And now we hope our Remonstrant wil see how we will avoid our own contradiction. To say there was an order of administrations although there were no set and prescribed formes is no contradiction: You see it in the Churches practice. To say there was an order of prophecying given to the
1 Cor. 14. Church of *Corinth* by the Apostle *Paul*, and yet no stinted forms of prophecying imposed upon them, wee hope the Remonstrant himselfe will say is not contradictory.

But these quotations are blasted already; *it is but a silly ostentation of antiquity, that these men bring against the Liturgie*; so is all wee bring if the Remonstrant may be judge: but wee appeale to the learned Reader. And what can our Remonstrant accuse us of: First in our quotation of *Tertullian*, *Wee mis-english it, Sine Monitore quia de pectore, without any prompter, but their own heart.* Is this a mistranslation? what then will you say to that approved Glossator *Zephirus*? who thus expounds this place; *Our Prayers are not dictated to us as are the Prayers of the Heathens, by their Priests, but proceed from the bottome of our hearts*, &c. Is not this to pray without any other prompter but their own hearts? Nor doth *Heraldus* contradict this sence. If *Zephirus* his Glosse like not you, your English likes us, as well as our owne, and proves

proves what wee deſire. ***Sine Monitore*: *not being urged by any ſuperiour injunction***, though wee thinke Monitor may as well be tranſlated prompter as injunction; but if no injunction, how could it be a Liturgy, a commanded, impoſed forme? and if neither of theſe, neither *Zephirus* nor your own pleaſe you, then take *Nicholas Rigaltius*. The Heathens had a Monitor that led them along in their prayers, out of a writing, that they might miſſe nor miſtake no words, &c. *yet what is this to a preſcribed forme?* yes, if they prayed *ſine Monitore*, it overthrows a preſcribed forme, read it as you will; if you read it without a *prompter* it overthrowes a *forme*, if it be as you read it *without any Superiour injunction*, it overthrows a preſcribed *forme*.

Dictatas à ſacrificulo preces non concipimus, ſed ex ipſa ſede Animi Spirituſq; noſtri cum ſuſpiritus gemituque, &c.
Nicholl. Rigalt. I. C. in Tertull. Animad. *Apud Ethnicos, Monitor præibat precet, ac de ſcript. quidem ne quid verborum præteriretur aut præpoſterum diceretur, rurſuſque alius cuſtos erat, qui attenderet, alius qui linguis favere juberet.*

But why may not we ſaith the *Remonſtrant*, ***as well argue, that becauſe our Miniſters doe ordinarily in their pulputs pray for the King in their own expreſſions, therefore there is no forme of Liturgie enjoyned?*** quite from the purpoſe; we ſhew you in *Tertullian*, where there were prayers that were not ſtinted and preſcribed forms, ſhew us if you can in *Tertullian*, any ſuch there were.

Our other teſtimony out of *Tertullian* and *Auſtine*, is full to the purpoſe we intended; wee brought them to prove that it was free for Chriſtians to pray as their occaſions did require, without being limited to preſcribed formes: and though we will not ſay peremptorily there were no publique *Liturgies* in *Auguſtines* time, yet we dare ſay the place hee brings proves it not, in which there is not one word of ***preſcribed or publike forms***.

The changing of *orationes ſuas* in the text, into *orationes noſtras* in his margin is not over-much faithfulneſſe.

The next place he quarrels with, is *Juſtin Martyr*,

πρωτὰς διαλογιζόμενος πολλῶν

the fault there is in the Translation, ὁ πρωτοστὰς, *is guiltily translated the instructer of the people*, ὅσῃ δύναμις, *falsly turned according to his ability*. We must quit our selves of both these crimes: First, πρόεδρος, we render not the word but the person, the instructor of the people, because the same Father but a few lines before told us, that was his proper work, and why should the *Remonstrant* cal this *a guilty translation*? Did he think we were affraid to use the word President or *Bishop*, for fear of advantaging the adverse cause? No such matter, take it, translate it you, Bishop if you please, make this πρόεδρος to be the same with ὁ ἄγγελος, in the Apocalyps, what will you gain by it? but this, that such a President or Bishop there was in every Congregation, whether in the City or Country.

πάντων καλὰ πόλεως ἢ ἄγγελος μιμούντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συμβαλεύσις γίνεται

But besides the supposed guilt, we are charged with false Translation for turning ὅσῃ δύναμις, according to his ability, if this be a false Translation, let the crime lie upon *Langius*, and not contradicted by *Sylburgius* in his notes, who before us translated ὅσῃ δύναμις *quantum pro virili potest*, which wee know not how to conster better then according to his ability. And this *Remonstrant* grants they *did pray according to their ability, and so* (saith he) *do ours, and yet we have a publike Liturgie, and so had they*. It followeth not, that they had because we have; we would fain see better proofe of it.

Langius.

Bassander.

The *Remonstrant* thinks it is proof enough to picke a quarrell with what wee have spoken, and therefore scorns to trouble himself any further then to tell the Reader it is *Magisterially said by these men that set and imposed formes were not introduced till the* Arrian *and* Pelagian *Heresies did invade the Church, and as Clerkly they con-*

confute themſelves by their own teſtimony. So then, if wee cite teſtimony, it is not *Magiſterially ſpoken*, and how is it *Clerkly confuted*? Beſides what wee have done our ſelves, he vouchſafes us the honour to beſtow a marginall confutation upon us out of *Conc. Laod. cap.* 19. we will doe the Canon and the Cauſe right, and give you the full view of it. *Oportere ſeorſum primum poſt Epiſcoporum Homilias Catechumenorum Orationem peragi, & poſtquam exierunt Catechumeni eorum qui pœnitentiam agunt fieri orationem, & cum ii ſub manum acceſſerint & receſſerint fidelium, preces ſic ter fieri. Vnam quidem ſcilicet primam ſilentio, ſecundam autem & tertiam per pronuntiationem impleri, deinde ſic pacem dari, & ſic ſanctam oblationem perfici & ſolis licere ſacratis ad altare accedere & communicare.*

We deſire the Reader to remember that the queſtion is not about a ſet *Order* or *Rubrick*, (as the *Remonſtrant* calls it) of adminiſtrations, but about ſet and impoſed forms of prayer. Now what doth this Canon require? that after Sermon, Prayer ſhould be made firſt for the *Catechumeni*, Secondly, for the *penitents*, Thirdly, for the *faithfull*. But doth it binde to ſet forms of prayer in all theſe? that the Reader ſees it doth not, for ſome of the prayers required in that *Canon* are mentall prayers, therefore not ſtinted, nor preſcribed praiers, as appears by that clauſe in the Canon, which the *Remonſtrant* (ſhuffling up with much leſſe fidelity then we have done the *Milevitan* Councell) leaves out in his quotation

Vnam quidem, ſcilicet primam ſilentio.

But Clerklike wee confute our ſelves. Firſt, in going about to prove that ſet and *impoſed formes were not introduced till the* Arrian *and* Pelagian *hereſie did*

invade the Church, by the testimony of a Councell that was before Arrianisme. Hee that is so quicke to take others in their self cõfutations, doth as Clerklike confute himselfe, in granting that the *Laodicean Councell* was between the *Neocesarian*, and the *Nicene*, and yet so long before *Arrianisme*, as it seemes ridiculous to referre from the one to the other: Now the *Neocesarian Councell* was as *Binius* from *Baronius* computes in the yeer 314, and the *Nicene* was 325, or according to *Eusebius*, 320. And was the *Arrian heresie* just born at the period of the *Nicene Councell*? if not, why may not the *Arrian* Heresie invade the Church before the time of the *Laodicean* Councell, especially considering that the heresie of *Arrius* did trouble the Church sometime before it borrowed *Arrius* his name; and under his name, some yeers doubtles, before the *Nicen* Councell. Yet our meaning was not, to affix the introducing of set formes into the Church upon that Councell; the *Remonstrant* if that he had pleased might have conceived, that speaking of the bringing in such formes, wee shew how it was done by degrees. And first as a step, the *Laodicean* Councell did forbid mens varying their prayers as they listed, and did enjoyn all men to use the same prayers: περὶ τῦτου ἀνῆκεν ἀεὶ μιᾶς τῶν εὐχῶν πάντας καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπικρίσει καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐνδάτῃ ἀρτίλεκτον γίνεσθαι. This *Remonstrant* saith, we said, *was a forme of mans owne prescribing*. No, we said of a mans own composing; and how wil the *Remonstrant* disprove it from the words of the Canon? To prove our assertion we brought the words of the *Councel* of *Carthage*, which our *Remonstrant* derides as a grosse absurdity to explicate the Councel of *Laodicea*, by that of *Carthage*, which is yet no more then *Zonaras* did before us. But as the *Remonstrant* relates

lates it, the Fathers of *Carthage* will afford us little help. You ſhall heare themſelves ſpeak Reader, and then judge. *Vt nemo in precibus, vel patrem pro filio, vel filium pro patre nominet, & cum altari aſſiſtitur ſemper ad patrem dirigatur Oratio, & quicunque ſibi preces alunde deſcribit non iis utatur niſi prius eas cum fratribus inſtructoribus contulerit.* Where it appears firſt, that this Canon was made for poore ignorant Prieſts that knew not the difference between the Father and the Sonne. Secondly, that when this Canon was made, there was no ſet forme in uſe in the Church, for it cannot come under the poſſibility of imagination, that a man having a ſet form lying before him, ſhould ſo groſly miſtake as to name the Father for the Son, or the Son for the Father. Thirdly, that the limiting or circumſcribing the liberty in prayer was ſuch as did not tie him to a ſet *Liturgie*, but hee might uſe the help of any other prayer, ſo he did conferre with the more learned of his Brethren.

The *Milevitan Councell* went ſomething further, wherein hee challenges our fidelitie in *ſhuffling up the Councell*; our fidelity in citing of this *Councell* is nothing inferiour to his in this, and far above his in the former. Let the Reader conſider how much difference there is between what we ſpeak, and what the *Remonſtrant* reports from this Councell, and judge of the fidelity of both. If wee have for brevity ſake given too ſhort a repreſentation of the Canon, it will appeare upon a review, to redound onely to our own prejudice. The Canon is this, *Placuit etiam illud ut preces vel orationes*, &c. *quæ probatæ fuerint in Concilio ſive præfationes &c. ab omnibus celebrẽtur. Nec aliæ omnino dicantur in Eccleſia niſi quæ à prudentioribus Tractatæ, vel*

Quamvis poſtea hæc precum & aliarũ orationum conſcribendarum privata libido imperitos hominẽs uſque adeo invaſerit ut neceſſum fuerit in Concilio modum aliquem huic rei conſtitui ne temere quæcũq; orationes in uſum præſertim Eccleſiaſticum admittereꝛtur. Caſſand. pro ubi cit. Concu. Carth. & Mil.

vel à Synodo comprobatæ fuerint ne forte aliquid contra fidem, vel per ignorantiam, vel per minus studium sit compositum.

Where wee obſerve that this is the firſt mention of prayers to bee approved or ratified in a *Synod* and the reſtraining to the uſe of them.

Secondly, that the reſtriction was not ſuch but there was a toleration of ſuch Prayers as were *tractatæ à prudentioribus* uſed by the wiſe and prudent men in the Church as well as of thoſe Prayers that were approved by the *Synod*.

Thirdly, that the occaſion of this reſtriction was the prevention of Errour in the Church, *ne aliquid contra fidem, &c.* So that here the *Remonſtrant* may ſee how that we have made it good, that liberty in Prayer was not taken away, and ſet formes impoſed, till the *Arian* and *Pelagian Hereſie* invaded the Church: his owne quotations would have told him this.

Concil. Milevit. cont. Cæleſt. & Pelag.

Next to theſe Teſtimonies, as a ſtrong inducement to us to think that there were no *Liturgies* of the firſt and moſt venerable antiquity producible, wee added this conſideration, *that the great admirers of, and ſearchers after ancient* Liturgies *either Jewiſh or Chriſtian could never yet ſhew any to the World.* And now we verely thought that if the Sun did this day behold them, the *Remonſtrant* whoſe eys are acquainted with thoſe ſecrets and rarities that wee cannot bee bleſt with the ſight of, would have brought them to publique view for the defence of his owne Cauſe, but wee feare if there ever were any ſuch, the World hath wholy loſt them: he cannot ſerve you with a whole *Liturgie*, ſuch fragments as hee found ſerved in, wee ſhall anon taſt off.

His

His miſerable miſtake in ſaying *that part of the Lords Prayer was taken out of the Jewiſh formes*, we pardon becauſe hee doth halfe acknowledge it. So do wee, his prudent paſſing by in ſilence what wee objected againſt his confident aſſertion of *Peter* and *Iohns* praying by a forme, and that which wee brought of the Publican and Phariſe to make good what we objected, becauſe we know he cannot anſwere it.

The *Seder Tephillah* to which hee now refers being 700 yeers after Chriſt.

Anſw. *pag* 8.

Three things hee ſpeaks of, *The Lords Prayer*, the *Jewiſh Liturgies*, and *Chriſtian Liturgies*, for the *Lords Prayer* hee ſaith *nothing can bee more plain then that our Saviour preſcribed to his Diſciples, beſides the Rules, a direct forme of Prayer*, we grant indeed nothing can be more plaine then that both our bleſſed Saviour and *Iohn* taught their new Converts to pray, yet the Remonſtrant will have a hard task to prove from Scripture that either *Iohn* or our Saviour gave to their Diſciples publique *Liturgies* or that the Diſciples were tied to the uſe of this forme.

But though his proofe fall ſhort in the *Lords Prayer*, yet it is ſure he ſaith, *that Chriſt was pleaſed to make uſe in the Celebration of his laſt and heavenly Banquet, both of the faſhions and words, which were uſually in the Iewiſh Feaſts, as* Caſſander *hath ſhewed in his* Liturgica. Yet *Caſſander* who is his ſure proof ſaith but this, *obſervaſſe videtur* ſeemes to have obſerved. Secondly, the evidence of all this comes from no better authour then *Maymonides* who wrote not till above a 1000 yeers after Chriſt. Thirdly, though it were granted that our Saviour did *pro arbitrio* or *ex occaſione*, uſe the faſhion or words uſually in the Jewiſh feaſt, it doth not at all follow that he did aſſume theſe words and faſhions out of

of *Iewiſh Liturgies*; an Arbitrary cuſtome is one thing a preſcribed Liturgie is an other.

Yet to prove ſuch a Liturgie, that he might (as far as he can) ſtand to his aſſertion, he brings ſomething out of *Capellus*, the *Samaritan Chronicle*, and *Buxtorfius* his *Synagoga Iudaica*.

We begin with what he brings out of a *Samaritan* Chronicle, ſometimes in the hands of the famouſly learned *Joſeph Scaliger*, out of which hee tels us of an imbezel'd book, wherein were contained the Songs & Prayers uſed before the Sacrifices: which although we might let paſſe without danger to our cauſe, and anſwer, that they were onely divine Hymnes wherein there was alwayes ſome thing of prayer; becauſe the Remonſtrant himſelfe in his ſecond mentioning of them names onely Songs: and were there any thing for ſet prayers, it is like hee would have put down ſome thing of them in the Authors own words, as well as hee hath burthened his margent with ſome thing which is nothing to the purpoſe.

De Emend. Tem?.

But we ſhall make bold (under correction) to examine the authority of his *Samaritan* Chronicle. *Joſeph Scaliger* had certainly but two *Samaritan* Chronicles (had he had any other he would certainly have mentioned it when hee undertooke to ſpeake of all accounts & Chronicles) whereof that ſhorter is printed in his *Emendat. Temporum, lib. 7.* which is ſo fond and abſurd a thing, that hee calls it *ineptiſſimum*: and there gives this cenſure of the *Samaritans* in point of antiquity: *Gens eſt totius vetuſtatis, etiam quæ ad ipſos pertinet, ignariſſima*: They are a people moſt ignorant of all antiquity, even of that which doth moſt concern

cerne themſelves. And more he would have ſaid againſt it, if he had lived to know how much it varied from the *Samaritans* owne *Pentateuch*, as it is ſince diſcovered by that learned Antiquarie Maſter *Selden* in his Preface *ad Marmora Arundeliana.*

This wee know is not the Chronicle the *Remonſtrant* means: there is another which *Scaliger* had, of which himſelf thus: *Habemus eorum magnum Chronicon ex Hebraica lingua in Arabicam converſum, ſed characere Samaritano deſcriptum: is liber incipit ab exceſſu* Moſis, *deſinit infra tempora Imperatoris* Adriani, *&c.* Wee have alſo their great Chronicle tranſlated out of the Hebrew into the Arabick tongne, but written in a Samaritan character: which Book begins from *Moſes* departure, and ends beneath the times of *Adrian* the Emperour, &c.

Of which Book *Scaliger* his own cenſure is, that though it hath many things worthy of knowledge, *Yet they are cruſted over with Samaritan devices*, and judge how much credit wee are to give to this Book for antiquity, as farre as *Moſes*, which makes no mention of their own originall any other ways, then that they came out of *Egypt* by *Moſes*: doth not ſo much as ſpeak of any of the ancient Kings of *Samaria*, nor the defection of the ten Tribes under *Rehoboam*, and doth onely touch the names of *Samſon, Samuel, David*, &c. as *Scaliger* ſpeaks in the beginning of his notes; and ſo will let your *Samaritan* Chron cle paſſe, and give you leave to make the beſt of it.

Commentis Samaritanis incruſtata.

But to this teſtimony, what ever it be, wee oppoſe the teſtimony of a learned *Jew*, who is rather to be

heard, then a *Samaritan*. The famous *Rabbi Moſes Maymonides*, who pleaſeth to read part of his firſt, ſecond, and eleventh Chapters, in his *Miſhneh of the Law*, *Halachah Tephillah*, ſhall evidently finde, that from *Moſes* his time to *Ezra* (above a 1000 yeeres) *there were no ſtinted forms of prayers heard of in the Iewiſh Church, but every man prayed according to his ability.* Secondly, that in *Ezra* his time eighteene ſhort forms of Prayers were compoſed for the ſcattered *Iews*, which had loſt the uſe of the holy language, becauſe they thought it beſt to continue their Prayers and Worſhip of God in that ſacred tongue. Thirdly, but not a word of any ſet forms which the Prieſts or Levits were to uſe, but only to helpe the ignorant *Iews*, to expreſſe themſelves in prayer to God in the holy language; at the time or houres of prayer, *Whith the men of the great* Synagogue *had appointed*: *Peter* and *John* went up together to the Temple at the houre of prayer, being the ninth houre.

Though we alleage not this of *Maymonides*, as a teſtimony to command beliefe, yet wee conceive it farre more to be regarded then any *Samaritan* Chronicle.

Secondly, hee hath ſome ſcraps of *Iewiſh* Liturgies out of *Capellus*, concerning which a ſhort anſwer may ſerve; firſt there is not one of the *Iewiſh* Liturgies now extant, which was made before the *Iews* ceaſed to be the Church of God: for beſides the eighteene ſhort formes before mentioned, there were no other made till *Rabbi Gamaliel* his time, who according to the judgment of learned Criticks is that *Gamaliel* mentioned in the *Acts*, (from whom *Paul* got ſuch bitter principles againſt Chriſtian Religion.) But whenſoever

ver they began, *Capellus* would laugh, ſhould he heare what a ſtrange conceit this Remonſtrant had gotten from him, that the *Iewiſh* Liturgies were as ancient as the time of *Moſes*, merely, becauſe he parallels ſome *Iewiſh* phraſes which hee found in them with certaine phraſes in the Goſpell, which the *Iews* retained by Tradition from their Fathers, and put into their Liturgies. But *Buxtorfius* would fal out with him, that he ſhould ſo much abuſe him, as to ſay he had affirmed that *Maymonides* took his Creed out of the Liturgie; for the man is not guilty of any ſuch groſſe miſtake: he ſaith indeed, that the Articles of the *Iewiſh* Creed are printed in the Liturgies, but withall hee tels the Remonſtrant, that *Maymonides* was the firſt compoſer of them, whence therefore the *Jews* put them into their Liturgie. Thus wee leave his *Jewiſh* Liturgie, which the Reader will eaſily ſee to be more *Jewiſh*, then hee could juſtly ſuppoſe our inſtance of *William Rufus* was, and that it affords him as little furtherance.

Synag. Iudaica, lib. 1.

For Chriſtian Liturgies, which the Remonſtrant had affirmed *to have been the beſt improvement of the peace and happineſſe of the Evangelicall Church ever ſince the Apoſtles times*, we challenged the Remonſtrant, ſetting aſide thoſe that are confeſſedly ſpurious, to produce any Liturgie that was the iſſue of the firſt 300 yeers; in anſwer to which, he brings us forth the Liturgies which we have under the names of *James*, *Baſil*, and *Chryſoſtome*: to which our Reply may be the briefer, becauſe hee himſelfe dares not vouch them for the genuine writings of thoſe holy men. *Onely*, ſaith hee, *we have them under their names*: Secondly, he confeſſeth

there are *some interſertions ſpurious in them.* Thirdly, all that he affirmes is, that *the ſubſtance of them cannot be taxed for any other then holy and ancient*: what cenſure the learned Criticks, both Proteſtants and Papiſts have paſt upon theſe Liturgies, we hope the Remonſtrant knows; we will onely mind him of what the learned *Rivetus* ſpeaks of the Liturgies of *Iames, Peter, Matthew, Mark, his omnes profectas eſſe ab inimico homine qui bonæ ſementi Domini, nocte ſuperſeminavit zizania ſolidis rationibus probavit Nobiliſque & illuſtris Philip Mornæus lib.* 1. *de Miſſæ & partibus ejus.* Which becauſe the Remonſtrant ſo often finds fault with our miſengliſhing, wee leave to him to ſee if hee can conſtrue theſe *Zizania* to be any other then theſe Liturgies, and this *inimicus homo* to be any other then the *Devill.*

Nor will *his implication of the ancient Councell of Ancyra* helpe him, which forbade thoſe Prieſts that had not ſacrificed περισσὸν ὁμιλεῖν ἢ λειτουργεῖν, Will the Reſtrant ſay that λειτουργεῖν τὰ τῶν ἱερατικῶν λειτουργιῶν, was to ſerve in the holy Liturgies, that is, reading ſet Litnrgies, he may as wel ſay that ὁμιλεῖν is the reading of ſet Homilies. *Balſamon, Zonaras, Dionyſius, Iſidore,* and *Gentian Harvei* doe all tranſlate λειτουργεῖν τὰ τῶν ἱερατικῶν λειτουργιῶν *aliquod munus ſacerdotale ſubire.*

And that the *Remonſtrant* may not delude himſelf nor others with the ambiguitie of the word λειτουργία & λειτουργεῖν, as if every mẽtion of theſe did by implication prove ſuch a Liturgie, as for which he contends. Let him know that the word λειτουργία is variouſly uſed in Antiquity ſometimes for all the Miniſteriall Offices, ſo *Zonaras in Concil. Antioch. Can.* 4. and ſo *Concil.* 4. *Ancyra. Can.* 1. quoted by himſelfe, if hee would either

λειτουργίαν ἐν ταυθ' ὁ μόνον, &c. ἀλλ' ἅπαν ἀρχιερατικὸν δίκαιον

ther have obſerved, or acknowledged it: ſometimes only for prayer, ſo *Balſamon in Can.* 12, *Concil. Sardic.* 6. Sometimes ſinging of our Pſalmes is tearmed by *Chryſoſtome*, καλὴ λειτουργία. The ſame Father expounds λειτουργοῦντων, *Acts* 13. by κηρυττόντων, *Hom.* 27. *in Act.* ſo that for the proof of ſuch Liturgies as are the Subject of this queſtion, it is not enough to ſhew us the word λειτουργία, or λειτουργεῖν in antiquity, let him ſhew the thing before he ſo *Dictator*-like condemne thoſe for *giddy heads* that will not take his word for proofs, and believe it was the *undeniable practice of antiquity to uſe Liturgies and formes of prayer*, becauſe he ſaith ſo.

λειτουργίαν ἀντὶ ὠιδῆς. *Chryſoſt. Pſal.* 41

His ſupercillious cenſure upon our paſſage about conceived prayer, is not worth the taking notice of, he ſaith, *We are ſullen and crabbed peeces, teechy and quarrelſome men*, and why? becauſe we ſaid his large prayſes of conceived prayer, were but a vantage ground to advance publike forms the higher, how truly judg; what cauſe we had ſo to think wee declared from the cruell and ungodly practices of the late times which he will ſcarce take notice of.

Quis tuleris Gracchos.

Our arguing about the originall and confirmation of our Church Liturgie, he calls *wrangling*. For the originall, the Remonſtrant ſaid it was taken out of the ancient Models, not Roman but Chriſtian: here wee tooke notice of the oppoſition betweene Roman and Chriſtian, becauſe by the Remonſtrant made *Termini ſeſe mutuò removentes*: which we perceive now hee is not willing ſhould paſſe for his meaning, hee will not have it meant of an oppoſition, but of a different modification. Though his inſtances brought to exemplifie it are not all *ad oppoſitum*.

We

We will not make digreſſive excurſions into new controverſies, though wee are not affraid of *burning our fingers with his hot Iron.* Only wee tell him, that the *Suffrages of unqueſtionable Divines* are not *ſo unanimous*, but that from ſome of them wee could fetch ſparks to fling in the face of him that deſired their ſuffrages, without burning our-own fingers. Compare what the booke called the *Old Religion* ſpeaks of the Church of *Rome*, *p.6.* where a ſpeech imputed to *Luther* is juſtified *as a charitable and not too indulgent a profeſſion*, viz. *That under the Papacie is all good, true Chriſtianitie, the very kernel of Chriſtianity*, &c. Compare this with what the Biſhop of *Salisbury* ſaith in his begged ſuffrage, who thus ſpeaks, *That the Church of* Rome *is no more a true Church than an arrant Whore is a true wife to her husband.*

To diſprove what he affirmed, that *the Liturgy was taken out of* Models *not Roman but Chriſtian*, We produced King *Edwards* Proclamation, to which he anſwers nothing, onely ownes that, and ſcornes us: thinking to wipe off all exceptions with the glorious names of Martyrs and Confeſſors that compoſed it. For whom (though wee dare not glory in man) yet wee bleſſe God as well as he. But with all if we ſhould ſay there were ſome holy Martyrs and Confeſſors of the ſame reformed Religion that were Oppoſers of it, and ſuffered in oppoſition even to a perſecution, the lives of ſome of them being purſued from City to City, (which he knows is moſt true, and ſo may any that will read the booke called the *troubles of Frankfort*) Would this be a ſufficient argument in his judgment for the removall of it? But this is not the ſtrength by which our Liturgie ſtands, *it ſtands confirmed by Parliamentary*

liamentary Acts, and King James his Proclamation; to which wee anſwered, that neither the King nor the Parliament intended ſuch a rigorous preſsing of the Liturgie as we have felt. Secondly, that neither our own Laws nor the Proclamation of that ever admired Prince are as unalterable as the Lawes of the *Medes* and *Perſians*; this he cals a *bold flout*, of purpoſe to render us odious to our dread Sovereigne, and the Honorable houſe; as likewiſe in the next *page* ſeems to impute that language to us, which is his own: our loyall hearts ſtartle to think of a repetition of the words, they are in *pag.* 23. of the *Defence*, and are concerning King *James*, whom in the clauſe wee had laſt in hand, wee mentioned with the deſerved memory of a famous and ever admired Prince. We confeſſe in ſome paſſages of that booke, wee tooke liberty to uſe ſome cheerfull expreſsions, provoked thereto by the ſtrange confidence, and little ſtrength of our Remonſtrant, Remembring that of *Tertullian*, *It wel agrees with truth to laugh, becauſe it is of a pleaſant diſpoſition, and to ſport with her competitors, becauſe it is ſecure, and feares not the wals of her bulwarks.* But what ever we have done in other places, here (wee atteſt the great Searcher of hearts) it never came into our thoughts to uſe a light expreſsion, much leſſe to *flout* in ſo bold a manner as hee accuſeth us. Nor doe wee thinke it poſsible that any charitable Reader could ſuppoſe wee aimed at any other then what we expreſſe more plainly *pag.* 20. of our anſwer, of the power of Princes and Parliaments in changing their laws.

His next buſineſs is with our queres, the firſt whereof was this, *Whether it be not fit to conſider of the alteration of*

of the Liturgie, which we hoped had beene preſented in ſuch modeſt termes (ſpeaking of an *alteration*, not an utter abrogation, of conſideration of an alteration not preſcribing the alteration, onely of a fitnes of ſuch an alteration, not of the neceſsity of ſuch an alteration as ſhould never have occaſioned ſuch a ſarcaſticall Declaration, as he their makes.

The thing propounded is ſo equall that the *Remonſtrant* who makes conſcience to agree with us in as little as hee may: here is forced to confeſſe much againſt his will (for which we may thank the Honorable Parliament) *there is ſome need of alteration*, but this cõfeſsion is joined with ſuch a height of ſcorn t ſeems to threaten thoſe who ever they are that ſhould dare attempt it, & expreſt in ſuch away of diminution, as gives juſt cauſe to ſuſpect, it is a meer deſigne to gain upon the *Parliament*, and by a pretended ſhadow of an alteration to prevent a reall and totall reformation; he tels us of *wiſer heads then our own, that will conſider of the alteration*: if here hee mean the Parliament, hee meanes the ſame to whom wee have preſented theſe conſiderations, concerning whom wee doubt not, but they will make another manner of an alteration then the *Remonſtrant* ſpeaks of, conſiſting onely of a *bare change of a few expreſſions*, *and that in the manner of them Onely*.

But if theſe *wiſe heads* hee here ſpeaks of, are ſuch as his own, that it may be are complotting ſome kind of a caſtigation of the *Liturgie*, then wee feare that although the times will not ſerve to make ſuch an alteration, as that of the *Engliſh Liturgie* ſent into *Scotland*: yet the alteration is like to be no better than in

Queene

Queene *Elizabeths* time, when the Parliament having given order for the alteration and correction of the *Letany*, all the Alteration that was made in it, was onely the taking out of that one ſuffrage, from the *Pope of* Rome, *and all his deteſtable enormities, good Lord deliver us.*

The *Remonſtraut* tels us of a Martyr (whom he cals *Silly* and *Ignorant*, wee dare not) Doctor *Taylor* that magnified the *Liturgy* to Biſhop *Gardiner*, as compleat; but where this ſtory is you tell us not; wee could anſwer ſtory with ſtory, which would pleaſe you much leſſe then this doth us: we could tell you of a Martyr that ſaid it was the *Mark of the Beaſt to receive from the Biſhop a Licence to preach*; Wee could tell you of that Doctor *Taylor*, who when hee was degraded, having his corner Cap, and the reſt of his Prieſtly Robes put on, when they were taken off again, ſaid hee, now *I am rid of my fools coat.*

That our propoſition of entring into conſideration about altering the *Liturgie*, might not ſeeme unreaſonable, wee ſet downe our reaſons enforcing ſuch alteration; all which the *Remonſtrant* brings under the ſeverity of his cenſure. Firſt, (wee ſay) it ſymbolizeth ſo much with the Popiſh Maſſe, as that the Pope would have approved it: which hee denyes not, if he had, we could have proved it from a man above ſuſpition in this cauſe, Doctor *Morton*. Onely hee ſaith, *If the Devill confeſſe Chriſt to be the Son of God, ſhal I diſclaim the truth, becauſe it paſſed through a damned mouth?* but you know Sir, that Chriſt would not receive ſuch a Confeſsion from the *Devils mouth*, nor *Paul* neither, *Act.16.* and loth wee would be to go to

the *Devill* to learne a confession. It is true, *Gold in the impurest Chanell is not to be contemned*, but what need we goe to the Chanell for gold, when wee can have it in the purest stream? or what need we goe to the *Roman Portuise* for a Prayer, when wee can have one more free from jealousies in another place? Will a wiseman goe to the Stews to seek an honest woman to make his wife?

Our second Reason why wee propounded this quære was, because this was compo.ed into this forme on purpose to bring the Papist to our Churches, which wee finde to bee with so little successe, &c. In answer to which the *Remonstrant* first *commends the project as charitable and gracious.* The nature of the project wee never intended to dispute, onely wee produced this to shew that there was not the same reason for the retaining of this forme, that there was for the first introducing of it, because experience tels us it hath not prevailed to that end to which it was at first designed. Yes it did, saith the *Remonstrant*; for Sir Edward Coke *tels us, till the eleventh yeere of Queene* Elizabeth *all came to Church, those times knew no recusant.* Pardon us Sir, If we tell you that it was not the converting power of the Liturgie, but the constraining power of the Law that brought them thither; which afterwards not being pressed with that life and vigour that it had bin, gave incouragemẽt to the *Popish* fact ō, to take heart: adde also, that at the same time the Pope negotiated to have her Liturgie to be allowed by his authority, so as the Queene would acknowledge his Supremacie, which when it grew hopelesse, then the Jesuitish Casuists begun to draw on the Papists to

We know the Apostles did upon this ground, tolerate the Iewish Ceremonies awhile, but when they saw the Iews remayning hardned still, they quickly purged the Church of them.

a Recuſancie. But might the complying of our Papiſts be attributed ſoly to the inoffenſiveneſſe of our *Liturgie*; Yet what credit is this to our Church to have ſuch a forme of publike worſhip, as Papiſts may without offence joyne with us in, and yet their Popiſh principles live in their hearts ſtill? How ſhall that reclayme an erring ſoule, that brings their bodies to Church, & leaves their hearts ſtil in error? And whereas the *Remonſtrant* would impute the *not winning of Papiſts rather to the want or weakneſſe in preaching*; Be it ſo, in the mean time, let the *Biſhops* ſee how they will cleere their ſouls of this ſinne, who having the ſole power of admitting Miniſters into the Church, have admitted ſo many weak ones, and have rejected ſo many faithfull, able Preachers, for not conforming to their beggerly rudiments. And when we ſaid that this our Liturgie hath loſt us many rather then wonne any, Wee meant not onely of ſuch as are loſt to the Popiſh part. But let the *Remonſtrant* take it ſo, it is neither paradox nor ſlander. For let an acute Jeſuite have but this argument to weild againſt a Proteſtant not well grounded in our Religion (as too many ſuch there are in *England*) It is evident that the Church of *Rome* is the ancient and true Church, and not yours, for you ſee your Service is wholly taken out of ours, How would a weake Chriſtian expedite himſelfe here?

To the third reaſon, this quære was grounded upon the many ſtumbling blocks the Liturgie lays before the feet of many. He tels us that *theſe ſtumbling blocks are remov d by many*. We confeſſe, indeed, endeavours uſed by many, whether effected or no that we queſti-

Among the reſt Maſter *Abbot* who is we quoted in our anſwer but by a miſtake it is referred to the fourth reaſon inſtead of this.

on; wee know it is no easie thing, when a scruple hath once taken possession of the conscience to cast it out again. Among the many, the *Remonstrant* is pleased to refer us to Master *Fisher* (for himself will not vouchsafe to foule his fingers with the removing of one of those blocks we mentioned) whose book, among all that have travelled in that way, we think that any intelligent Reader will judge most unable to give solid satisfaction to a scrupling conscience. Tell us wee beseech you, is it enough for a conscience that scruples the Surplice, to say, *That it is as lawfull for you to enjoyn the Surplice, and punish the omitting of it, as it was for* Solomon *to enjoin* Shimei, *not to goe out of* Jerusalem, *and to punish him for the breach of that injunction?* or, *That the Surplice is a significative of divine alacritie and integritie, and the expectation of glory? Is it possible that a man that reads this should stüble at the Surplice* after? *The Cross is not onely lawfull in the use of it, but the removall of it would be scandalous and perillous to the State; Baptisme is necessary to salvation; Children dying unbaptized are in a forlorne condition, therefore Midwives may baptize,* &c. Let the Reader judge whether this be to remove stumbling blocks from before the feet of men, or to lay more. But if this *Remonstrant* think Master *Fisher* so able and happy a remover of those occasions of offence, wee wonder how his quick sight could see cause of any alteration, so much as in the manner of the expression, knowing Master *Fisher* undertakes the defence not onely of the *Substance*, but of the very *Circumstances* and *Syllables* in the whole Book. But his last put off is this, that if there be ought in it that may danger scandall, it is under carefull hands to remove it. The

Lord

Lord be prayſed it is ſo: it is under carefull hands and hearts, more mercifull then this Remonſtrant is, to remit troubled Conſciences to No Better Cure then Maſter *Fiſhers* Book, who we hope will do by thoſe as the *Helvetians* did by ſome things that were ſtumbled at among them; though they were none but *Anabaptiſts* that ſtumbled at them, yet the State did by Authority remove them, and *Zwinglius* their profeſſed adverſary gives them thanks for occaſioning the removall.

To the fourth, which was that it is Idolized and accounted as the onely worſhip of God in *England*, &c. At *Amſterdame*, ſaith hee; but hee knew wee ſpoke of ſuch as adore it as an *Idoll*, not ſuch as abhorre it as an *Idoll*, though it pleaſeth him to put it off with a ſcoffe, retorting upon us, *others ſay, rather too many doe injuriouſly make an Idoll of preaching, ſhall wee therefore conſider of abandoning it?* We hope, Sir, you are not ſerious, if you be, & that not a little your ſelf is guilty of Idolizing the *Liturgy*. Dare you in cool bloode equalize this very individuall Liturgy with Gods Ordinance of preaching, and ſay there is as little ſinne or danger in conſidering of the utter abandoning of preaching, as there is in the abandoning of this preſent eſtabliſhed Liturgie? *Cave dixeris.*

The fift Argument was from the great diſtaſte it meets with in many. This hee imputes to nothing but their ill teaching, and betakes himſelfe to his old ſhifts of diverſion, and ſaith, *By the ſame reaſon, multitudes of people diſtaſting the truth of wholſome doctrine, ſhall we to humour them abandon both?*

It is a griefe to ſee this diſtaſt grow to ſuch a height as

as tends to a ſeparation; and it is as ſtrange to us that this *Remonſtrant* ſhould have a heart ſo void of pity as that the yielding to the altering or removing of a thing indifferent (which ſtands as a wall of ſeparation betwixt us and our brethren) ſhould be preſented to publike view under no better notion then the *humouring of a company of ill taught men*, or as the *Remonſtrant* elſewhere calls them *brainſick men*, or as another Booke, *men that have need of dark roomes and Ellebore.* For that ill teaching to which hee imputes this generall diſtaſt, if there be any ſuch, wee for our parts are innocent; our care for our part hath beene to informe our people, that ſuch ſtumbling blocks as theſe are not ſufficient cauſes of Separation. But wee thinke, nay, we know, that ſome few *Prelats* by their over-rigorous preſſing of the *Service-book* and *Ceremonies*, have made more Separatiſts, than all the Preachers diſaffected to the Ceremonies in *England*. Our laſt reaſon was from the difference betweene this and all other Churches. To which he anſwers, *that difference in Liturgies will breed no diſ-union between Churches.* Secondly, if it be requiſite to ſeeke conformity, *our is the more ancient Liturgie, and our the more noble Church: Therefore fit for them to conforme to us rather then we to them.* It is true, every difference in *Liturgies* doth not neceſſitate a diſ-union of Churches: but here the difference is too large to be covered with a few fig-leaves. It is too well known, our Ceremonies and other things in our Liturgies will not downe with other reformed Churches: to the ſecond, it is not the precedencie in times that gains the Glory, but the exactneſſe of the work.

Our

Our firſt Reformation was onely in doctrine, theirs in doctrine and diſcipline too. For the third, that *ours is the more noble Church.* We deſire not to eccliſe the glory of this Church, but rather to intreat the Lord to increaſe it a thouſand fold, how great ſoever it be, and to ennoble it in this particular, in removing what ever is a ſtumbling block out of the way of his people. But why ſaith the Remonſtrant ſhould we rather conforme to the Liturgies of the Reformed Churches, then thoſe of all other *Chriſtians, Grecians, Armenians, Copths*, &c. ſhould we ſet down what wee have read in the Liturgies of thoſe Churches, wee believe the Remonſtrant would bluſh for intimating, there is as much reaſon to conform to their Liturgies as thoſe of the Reformed Churches.

Our ſecond quære is not ſo weak as this Remonſtrant ſuppoſeth; it is this, whether the firſt Reformers of Religion did ever intend the uſe of a Liturgie, further then to be a help in the want, and to the weaknes of the Miniſters? In way of Anſwer he asketh, *Whether we can think that our Reformers had any other intentions then all other the founders of Liturgies.* No, indeed, wee thinke no other, and howſoever the *Remonſtrant* according to his confidence tels us that the leaſt part of their care was the helpe of the Miniſters weakneſſe, yet their words tell us it was the main drift of thoſe that firſt brought preſcribed forms of prayer into the Church (and therefore wee conceived it might poſsibly be the intention of our Reformers alſo) witneſſe the 23 Canon of the fourth Councell of *Carthage, ut nemo patrem nominet pro filio, &c.* So the Compoſers of the Liturgie for the French Church in

Fran-

in *Frankfort*, *Hæ formulæ ſervium tantum rudioribus, nullius liberiati præſcribitur. Theſe formes ſerve onely for the ignorant, not preſcribing to any mans liberty.* And were it ſo that *the mayn drift of the Compoſers of* Liturgies *were to helpe the devotion of the people*, yet (what a help to devotion many find it, though we diſpute not) it will be hard for this Remonſtrant to perſwade many thouſands who deſire with devout hearts to worſhip God, that the being conſtantly bound to the ſame formes, though in themſelves neither for matter nor compoſure ſubject to juſt exception, will prove ſuch a great help to their devotion. But this wee are ſure, that if *the knowing before hand the matter and the words wherewith it ſhould be clothed make people the more intent upon devotion*, if this be an infallible argument, it pleads againſt the uſe of preſent conception, either in praying or preaching, or any other adminiſtration either publike or private: and how contradictory this is to what the *Remonſtrant* hath profeſſed of his reverent and pious eſteem of conceived prayer, let himſelfe ſee.

It is neither *boldly* nor *untruly* ſaid, that all other reformed Churches, though they uſe Liturgies, do not bind Miniſters to the uſe of them: If we may truſt the Canons and the Rubricks of thoſe Churches we may both boldly and truly ſay it.

Har. Synod. Belg. cap. 11. Can. 21. Miniſter preces vel dictante ſpiritu, vel certa ſibi propoſita formula concipiet.

In the Canons of the *Dutch* Churches, agreed upon in their Synod, we find a Canon enjoyning ſome days in every week to be ſet apart for preaching and praying, and the very next Canon ſaith, the Miniſter ſhall conceive prayers either by the Dictate of the Spirit, or by a ſet forme. So in the firſt Rubricke of the Liturgie

turgie of *Geneva*, the Miniſter is to exhort the people to pray, *quibus ei viſum fuerit verbis*, in what words he ſhall think fit; and though that Liturgie containe formes of prayer for publike uſe, yet we doe not finde in all that Liturgie where they are tyed to the uſe of thoſe forms, and no other; we finde, where they are left free, as in one place, *in Dominico die mane hæc ut plurimum adhibetur formula*, Upon the Lords Day in the morning, for the moſt part this prayer is uſed; for the moſt part, then not alwayes. So in another, after the Lords Super, this thankſgiving or ſome other like it is uſed; then they are not abſolutely tied to the uſe of that: and by this wee have learned how to conſtrue what he hath quoted out of Maſter *Calvine*. And indeed any man that reads that Epiſtle may eaſily conſtrue what was Maſter *Calvines* judgement about Liturgies, not that men ſhould be ſo tied to words and forms, as to have no liberty to recede from them. For in the ſame Epiſtle hee doth adviſe to have a ſummary collection of doctrine which all ſhould follow, and to the obſerving of which all, both Biſhops and Miniſters ſhould be bound by Oath; Yet we hope the *Remonſtrant* will not ſay that *Calvine* did adviſe that Biſhops and Miniſters ſhould be bound by oath not to vary from that forme of doctrine? *Calvine* adviſes a ſet form of Catechiſme, will the *Remonſtrant* ſay that *Calvine* meant the Miniſters ſhould never vary from the ſyllables of that forme, provided they did dictate *pro captu populi*, *in quibus ſitus ſit verus Chriſtianiſmus*? The very words by himſelf quoted ſhew what *Calvins* end was in adviſing a ſet *Liturgie*, viz. to helpe the ſimplicity and unskilfulneſſe of ſome, to

Peracta cœna hæc gratiarum aut aliqua ei ſimilis adhibetur.

prevent the innovation of others, & that the consort of all Churches among themselves might more certainly appeare, all which ends may be obtained without limiting all Ministers to the words and syllables of a set forme, provided they pray to that effect. Which is all that is required in the *Liturgies* of other Churches.

Wee could name you many other *Liturgies*, wherein there are not further bounds laid upon the Minister then thus, *Hæ sunt formulæ, quas tamen sequitur Minister pro suo arbitrio*, These are forms which the Minister follows according to his liking. And again, *Spiritus sanctus non est alligandus formulis*, The Holy Ghost is not to be tyed to forms. *Minister concludit Orationem, quam pro suo arbitrio dicit. Hæc esto formula nisi quid ille suâ sponte possit melius.* The Minister concludes the prayer, which hee sayes according to his own discretion: let this be that forme, except of his own accord hee can doe better. In another, *Minister ad precandum hisce aut similibus verbis invitat ad hunc modum orat*, in these or the like words.

And by this, (we hope) the *Remonstrant* seeth that what wee have said, was more truly then boldly spoken. As for the *Lutheran* Churches, though we blesse God for that truth, that is among them, for that glorious instrument of their Reformation, yet we think the *Remonstrant* will not say, that the *Lutheran* Churches came out so perfectly in the first Edition, but that *desiderantur nonnulla*, nor can he be ignorant, that in the ordinary phrase of writing, they are called the Protestant Churches, the other the Reformed Churches: and what if the Reformed Churches be as the

Re-

Remonſtrant calls them, out of his reſpect hee beares them, but a poore handfull? yet is this handfull in reſpect of purity, of truth, and worſhip among them, to be preferred before all the Chriſtian World beſides.

The Rubrick in the Liturgie of *Edward* the ſixth, ſaith he, is miſconſtrued, *Becauſe it intends onely the peoples eaſe and more willing addiction to hearing.* Two of the very ends for which wee deſire a liberty; which if ſome Ordinaries (upon his certain knowledge) have often yielded, many now upon our certaine knowledge have denied it, and ordered Sermons ſhould rather be conſtantly cut ſhort then any part of the Liturgie omitted, why ſhould it be a fault in us to deſire that as a favour from this Honourable Houſe, which the *Remonſtrant* grants an ordinary may without offence yield at his own diſcretion?

3 The Homilies we ſay are left free, reaſon therefore the Liturgie ſhould: which argument he confeſſeth might hold force, did they utterly abridge all Miniſters of the publike uſe of any conceived prayers. We know ſome men have endevoured ſacrilegiouſly, to rob all Miniſters of the exerciſe of the gift of prayer, on what occaſion ſoever: And our argument is as ſtrong againſt limiting in prayer, as it is againſt limiting in preaching, either in whole or in part, and he ſaith nothing againſt it, onely determines *tanquam è Cathedrâ, that it is no leſſe ſacrilege to rob the people of a ſet form, by the liberty of a free expreſſion, Then it is to rob them of the Miniſters gift of preaching or praying.* But the Remonſtrant muſt prove that ſet forms and Liturgies ſtinted and enjoyned, are not onely lawfull, but Ordinances of God, and not only warranted but comman-

ded, as well as preaching or praying, before he doe ſo peremptorily conclude the taking or ſet formes away by the liberty of a free expreſſion to be ſacrilege; and his bold cloſure of this Anſwer, how true it is let him look in what we have ſaid before of the Liturgies of other Churches.

4 His fourth Anſwer, *That it is a falſe ground, that the impoſing of the book tyes godly men from exerciſing their gift in prayer*, would have been condemned for hereſie in ſome Conſiſtories in *England*, within theſe few yeeres, by ſuch as did, from the impoſition of the one, forbid the other. Whether the liberty of prayer be infringed wholly, by a ſet Liturgie, wee diſpute not. But it is beyond diſpute, that the not binding to a Liturgie would endanger the liberty of prayer leſſe.

5 Our fift Reaſon was, becauſe many deny their preſence at our Church-meeting, in regard of thoſe impoſed prayers, and we finde no better way to recover them from that diſtance in which they ſtand, then by leaving the Liturgie free. The *Remonſtrant* ſaith, *There is no reaſon of ſuch alienation from our aſſemblies upon ſuch grounds.* The reaſonableneſſe or unreaſonableneſſe of this we determine not; in the mean time wee are ſure thus it is. For our parts we profeſſe, that wee are not againſt a *free uſe of a Liturgie*, nor doe we count a Liturgie a ſufficient ground of ſeparation from the Church, we ſay with *Auguſtine*, *Non putamus ſcindendas eſſe Eccleſias, propter ea quæ nos ex ſe, neque digniores, neque indigniores, coram Deo facere poſſunt.*

Yet wee feare it is not the Remonſtrants Dilemma that will reduce ſuch as upon this ground are upon point of forſaking our Church aſſemblies. The *Li-*

turgie

turgie (ſaith hee) *is either good or evill, if evill it is not lawfull to be uſed, if good it is not unlawfull to be impoſed.* The perſons of whom wee ſpeake, and with whom in this argument he hath to deal will deny both, and tell him the Liturgie is neither good, nor yet may lawfully be impoſed if it were good, it may be the Remonſtrant might have work enough to perſwade ſome men of either: and whether it be eaſier to ſatisfie the conſciences of many thouſands in *England*, that are troubled about this, by argument and diſputing, or by looſing the bond of impoſition, and taking away the cauſe of diſpute and trouble, or to behold the confuſion that will follow, if the Lord do not in mercy direct to ſome means of prevention, is not hard to determine.

The *Remonſtrant* inclines to the third, and making it but a ſmall matter, turns it off with *O miſerable miſled people, whom nothing will reclaim but a perfect confuſion! a perfect deformity, a more profitable nonſence!* And ſo confident he is that this will be the iſſue, that though this confuſion appeare in no other Churches *who perhaps* (hee grants contradicting himſelfe) *begun without a Liturgie*; yet with us it could be no leſſe then what hee hath propheſied: yea, ſo reſolute he is not to yield to a liberty in what is eſtabliſhed, that whereas wee ſaid that liberty in Liturgies could breed no more confuſion then liberty in the *Homilies*, we evidently ſee by his anſwer, that had the reading of *Homilies* beene as ſtrictly enjoyned as the *Book of Common-prayer*, the ableſt Miniſter in *England*, were the Law in the *Remonſtrants* hands, muſt be held as ſtrictly to them, as to this. Yea, laſtly, whereas wee had ſaid, that if enjoyned

joyned at all, it might be as a punishment upon the insufficient, thereby to quicken them up to more diligence and care: he scoffs at this as *a singular project and unheard of mulct*; and yet himselfe comes out with a project about preaching, never a whit better, and doth as good as confirme our saying in the latter end; *Surely where God hath bestowed gifts, it is fit they should be imployed, and improved to the best advantage of his people: But where there is nothing but an empty, over-weening, and proud ignorance, there is great reason for a just restraint.* Let the ingenious Reader peruse the words, and consider how much they differ from that which he calls *our singular project*: and withall judge whether this conclusion of the *Remonstrant* after all his wrangling against our Queres, be not as like *Bellarmines, tutissimum tamen, &c.* as if it had beene cast in the same Scull? How this way that the *Remonstrant* hath chosen would speed, let the Reader judge: In the meane time we blesse God, who hath put it into the hearts of others, into whose hands hee hath concredited the work, to judge more wisely, and consider more mercifully; and to professe in the hearing of some of us, that they would willingly part with that which was indifferent to themselves, if they were but truly informed, it was offensive to others. According to that of *Gregory, Those customes which are knowne to bring any burthens upon the Churches, it becomes us to consider of the removing of them.*

This speech was spoken in the Lords house by a Noble Peere, and had the approbation of many others.

Greg. l. 6. epist. 6 ep. 64.

Thus we have vindicated the first part of our answer concerning Liturgie, Wherein we professe, as in the presence of God, that wee have written nothing out of a spirit of contention and faction, but onely as lovers

lovers of the Truth, and the peace of the Church, which is now miſerably divided in judgement and affections, and like a young Hart upon the mountains of *Bether*; which rents and diſtractions, wee are ſo far from fomenting, that wee would willingly goe over divers Seas (as *Calvin* once ſaid) to finde out one uniforme way of worſhipping of God, in which all Chriſtians might happily agree. We well know that peace is the *Helena*, that all are ſuiters unto; and wee know as well, that peace without truth is as a painted *Jezabell*, and to be thrown downe by all thoſe who are on the Lords ſide. And therefore it hath and alwayes ſhall be our chiefe care and prayer, that peace and truth may kiſſe & greet each other: And we hope that the Worthies of that Honourable Aſſembly, who are the great Patrons of peace and truth, will give a candid interpretation to theſe our endeavours, and will doe that for which preſent and ſucceeding generations may juſtly record them as the *Nehemiah's*, *Ezrae's*, and *Zorobabels*, of our decayed *Jeruſalem*.

Cant. 2. 17. *Bether in Heb.* is diviſion.

Pacem Eccleſiæ Martyrio præferimus. Cypr. *Pax ſine veritate eſt execrabile adulterium.* Cyp.

SECT. III.

THe buſineſſe of the third Section, is to extricate himſelfe from thoſe ſnares, in which his owne words have entangled him: his affection to his cauſe, had tranſported him to uſe ſome over-reaching expreſsions, lifting up the Antiquitie, and extending the Univerſalitie of *Epiſcopall* Government beyond truth,

truth, vilifying (as wee know his cuſtome is) vvhatſoever hath been ſpoken or vvritten to the contrary. Thoſe things we laid to his charge; Now ſee how miſerably he excuſeth himſelf: read the *Remonſtrance*, our collections from it in this Section, and judge whether he hath ſufficiently redeemed his credit, who hath neither made any one ingenious confeſsion of an overſight, nor yet made good what he had ſpoken; yet hee enters with his wonted confidence, perſwading himſelf he hath blown away all the arguments of the former Section, and lays on us unmercifully, calling us *Cavellers, Leaſers, Slanderers, Calumniators, worthy to be ſpit upon*, &c. Such let us be eſteemed, if we be found deſerving.

His firſt care, and almoſt his greateſt, is, to cleere himſelf from that which we ſpake of but by the way; His condemning all, that either writ or ſpoke againſt Epiſcopacy, as weak, or factious, *The God of heaven knows this* (ſaith hee) *never came within the verge of my thoughts.* Sir, wee cannot parly with your thoughts, but certainly if it were not in your thoughts, your words miſtake their errand: For this propoſition, *Epiſcopacie is cryed downe abroad either by weake or factious perſons*, We beſeech you, let your Logick (the want whereof you upbraid us vvith) tell us, *quæ, quanta, qualis*; if any man ſhould ſay it grieves his heart to heare, how the pure Proteſtant Religion is cryed downe *abroad*, by either weake or factious perſons, would this have been interpreted to concerne onely ſuch as cry downe the Proteſtant Religion here in *England*? Certainly, *abroad* not being limited, as it was not in your *Remonſtrance*, though now you would limit

limit it in your *Defence*, is a vvord of ſuch vaſt extent, as reacheth not onely beyond the bounds of the Parliament, but of the Kingdome too.

But ſee how juſtly you deale with us, where you perſonate us as ſaying, *Sure the man is not in his right wits, hear how he raves, ſure hee is in a deep phrenſie*: vvho ever ſpake of the Remonſtrant ſo contumeliouſly? It is language more like his, vvho ſends men *to darke rooms, and to Ellebore.* Wee ſaid indeed, the Remonſtrant *was ſelf-confounded*, and vvee know as vvell as you can tell us, there is a ſelf-confuſion that is the effect of *extream ſorrow*, ſuch a ſorrow as makes men ſpeak they knovv not vvhat; and ſo did this Remonſtrant: ſome of vvhich expreſsions hee yet juſtifies, ſome he minces. Pag. 35. *Epiſc. by divine Right, part. 2. p. 6*

This he juſtifies, and ſaith, hee ever will; that *hee is no peaceable, nor wel-affected ſonne of the Church of* England, *that doth not wiſh well to Liturgie and Epiſcopacie.* What? tell us novv once for all, whither the Parliament doe not here come under the *verge* of your Propoſition? Whom before you vvere ſo carefull to exempt by one vvord *abroad.* For this is vvell knowne, if all thoſe of the *Nobilitie, Gentrie, and Communaltie*, that at this time ſtand not vvell affected to the preſent Liturgie, and *Hierarchie*, are to bee counted factious and ill affected, the *Reverend Fathers* will have multitudes of diſobedient ſons to diſple. Pag. 35.

In the next page, he endevours to make good vvhat he had ſpoken in the *Remonſtrance*, that Epiſcopall government, by the joynt confeſsion of all Reformed Divines, derived it ſelfe from the times of the Apoſtles (vvithout the contradiction of any one Con-

gregation in the Christian World) unto this present Age. His *Defence* is first, *he said nothing of Diocesan Bishops* (then as good have said nothing at all) but *spake onely of Episcopall Government*: But vvas it not that *Sacred Government* vvhich some *seek to wound*? and vvhat is that but Government by *Diocesan Bishops*? vvhich he must prove to *derive it selfe from the Apostles times*, or else eat his vvords. Nay, more then so, hee must prove that *the joynt Confession of all Reformed Divines acknowledge it*; and not think to put the Reader and us off, with telling us, *no true Divines ever questioned, whether Bishops were derived from the Apostles or no, but what kind of Bishops they were*; Wee know what kinde of Bishops the *Remonstrant* pleads for, and of them he said, *by the joynt confession of all Reformed Divines, they were derived from the Apostles*: prove this, or acknowledge your errour. It is this kind of Bishops you must prove hath *continued in the Christian World unto this age, without the contradiction of any one Congregation*. We tell you of *Scotland* without Bishops: you would put us off with *China* and *Brasile*, &c. but are they parts of the Christian World, as *Scotland* is? You never meant that every place through the whole World *hath had a continued line of Bishops ever since the Apostles*, we thought you had; for we are sure it is the assertion of *Episcopall* men: else what is the meaning of Doctor *Halls semper* and *ubique*? and what is the meaning of that *irrefragable proposition? no man living, no History can shew any well allowed and setled Nationall Church in the whole Christian World, that hath been governed otherwise then by Bishops, in a meet and moderate imparity, ever since the times of Christ and his Apostles, unto this present age*. And what means

Pag 36. Bishop *Hall* saith expresly in *Episcopacie* by divine right, *p* 29. that *Timothy* was a Diocesan Bishop, and *Ephesus* a Diocesan Church; it seems you dare not say so.

Episc. div. Right a part. p. 113.

means that other expreſsion? *Turne over all Hiſtories, ſeeke the records of all times and places, if ever it can be ſhown, that any Orthodox Church in the whole Chriſtian World, ſince the time of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, was governed otherwiſe then by a Biſhop, Superiour to his Clergie (unleſſe perhaps during the time of ſome perſecution, or ſhort interregnum) Let me forfeit my part of the cauſe.* The inſtances brought to prove the falſneſſe of that Aſſertion, that *Epiſcopacie had never met with contradiction in any Chriſtian Congregation*, The one hee turns off with the evaſion of a perſonall quarrell; whereas the Hiſtories tell us it was an ancient cuſtome; and adds an odious Marginall ill becomming his ſo deeply proteſted loyalty to his *Sovereigne*, as if it were no leſſe crime to offer an affront to a Prelate, then to the King. The other inſtances of the Reformed Churches, he puts off with this ſhift; that *if wee did not wilfully ſhut our eyes, we might ſee he limited his time unto this preſent age.* Good Sir, bethink you, take up your *Remonſtrance*, read your own words, Mark the Parentheſis. *Epiſcopall Government derives it ſelf from the times of the Apoſtles without any interruption (without the contradiction of any one Congregation in the Chriſtian World) to this preſent age.* The limitation of time here, hath reference to the *continuance* of *Epiſcopacie*, not the contradiction of *Epiſcopacie*, that's hedged in with your parentheſis, which excludes your limitation. Juſt ſuch another is your *next*, having ſaid, *Epiſcopall Goverment continued in this Iland ever ſince the plantation of the Goſpel, without contradiction*; and being here taken in the manner, to ſalve your credit, you would here alter your words and ſence, and make it, that *it cannot be contradicted, that the forme of this Govern-*

Epiſc. div. Right part. 2. p. 110, 111.

Pag. 39.

Pag. 39.

Pag. 40.

ment hath continued in the Iſland ever ſince the firſt plantation of the Goſpel; pray review your words, and ſee how well they admit this ſenſe. *Were this Ordinance meerly humane, and Eccleſiaſticall, if there could no more be ſaid for it, but that it is exceeding ancient, of more then fifteen hundred yeares ſtanding, and that it hath continued in this Iſland ſince the firſt Plantation of the Goſpel, to this preſent day, without contradiction.* You would make the ſenſe to goe thus, this propoſition is true without contradiction, that Epiſcopall Government hath continued in this Iſland: we ſay the ſenſe muſt be thus, that this Government hath continued without contradiction, or hath received no contradiction, during all the time it hath continued, untill this preſent day.

If any impartiall Reader would not take the words in that ſence we did, rather then in the ſence you have drawn them to, let us be counted *ſlanderers*. But in excuſing the laſt miſtake, he would be a little more ſerious. The *Remonſtrant* had ſaid; *Except all Hiſtories, all Authors faile us, nothing can be more certain then this truth.* Pag. 41. Wee cry out here of ſuch a ſhameleſneſſe, as dares equall this opinion of his of *Epiſcopall Government*, to an *Article* of our *Creed*. This he doth ſeriouſly deny, profeſsing he ſpake it only *as an ordinary phraſe in hourly diſcourſe*; and did *Hee* ſo too, that in *Epiſcopacie by divine Righ*, *Part.2. pag.47.* ſaith, *That for his part, hee is ſo confident of the divine inſtitution of the Majoritie of Biſhops above Presbyters, that hee dare boldly ſay, there are weighty points of Faith, which have not ſo ſtrong evidence in Scripture.* And the ſame Author in the ſame place profeſſeth, *that men may with much better colour cavill at thoſe bleſſed Ordinances of God*, viz. (*conſecration and diſtribution*

of

of the holy Euchariſt, and baptizing of Infants) *then quarrell at the divine inſtitution of Biſhops.* God give the man leſſe confidence, or more truth: is not this to equalize this fancie to an *Article of the Creed?* Wee would not have caſt away ſo much time and paper upon this worthleſſe buſineſſe, but onely to cleer our ſelves from that *uncharitableneſſe*, *falſhood*, *lying*, and *ſlandring*, wherewith the *Remonſtrant* here beſpatters us. It is in his power to ſave himſelfe and us this ungratefull labour, if hee will give leſſe ſcope to his luxuriant pen, ſpeak more cautiouſly, let his words be more in weight, and leſſe in number.

SECT. IV.

IN the next Section, the *Remonſtrant* according to his *Rhetorick*, ſaith, *Now I hope, they wil ſtrike*; it is a Trope, *ſperare pro timere.* He had pleaded for the eſtabliſhment of *Epiſcopacie, the long continuance of it in the world, and in this Iſland*: this we called *Argumentum galeatum*, quoting *Hierom* for that Epithite, for which his great learning ſcoffs us. Well, wee muſt put it up; an argument, or if you will an *Almanack*, (for it is growing out of date apace) and *calculated for the Meridian of Epiſcopacie*, &c. meaning the argument, though applyed to Epiſcopacie, might ſerve for any other Right, Cuſtome, Order, Religion, that might plead antiquity, which hee denies not, but plainly grants, ſaying, it is *calculated for whatſoever Government*; *if ſo* Pag. 42.

long

long time have given it peaceable poſſeſſion; in ſo much, that could the Presbytery plead ſo long continuance, hee ſhould never yield his vote to alter it. No, ſhould not? to bring in that *Epiſcopall Government* which (ſaith the *Remonſtrant*) hath ſuch a *divine inſtitution, as not only warrants it, where it is, but requires it where it may be had.* How can theſe things conſiſt? Surely if your grounds for the *Divine Right* of *Epiſcopacie* be *Convictive* and *Irrefragable*, you muſt renounce that Government which is meerly humane, and Eccleſiaſticall, be the *Antiquity* of it never ſo *venerable*, if it ſtand in Competition with that which may plead a *jus divinum.*

To divert that which he ſaw would overthrow this plea, intitling the *Pope* to as much ſtrength in this argument as the *Biſhops*, he will needs add this: *That long continuance may challenge an immunity from thoughts of alteration, uuleſſe where the ground of the change is fully Convictive and Irrefragable.* But firſt, Sir, you muſt not make a limitation in your concluſion, above what was in your premiſes; but ſince you are at a dead lift, wee will take it in, and yet tell you, that this helps you no more, then the *Pope* ſtill: if he may judge, hee will ſay there is no reaſon for his abolition: may others judge, the ground is fully *Convictive* and *Irrefragable.* The *Biſhops* being Judges, and the *Remonſtrant*, they determine; no reaſon in the world for the change of *Epiſcopacie*; but what if others that muſt be Judges in this controverſie ſee grounds *Irrefragable*, and *Convictive*: where's your argument from the long ſtanding of *Epiſcopacie*? The other things which hee refers to their more proper place we ſhall expect there. Onely for his confident challenge he makes to us, *to name any*

man

man in this Nation that hath contradicted Epiſcopacie *till this preſent age*: We muſt put him in remembrance, that in his *Remonſtrance* his words were *unto this preſent day*. Which unleſſe hee will have recourſe to his Trope, is more then this Age, if by this age hee mean this laſt Century: but let it be this age, we can produce inſtances of ſome (and that long before this Age) in this Kingdome that have contradicted *Epiſcopacie*; and our inſtances ſhall not be mean. Pag. 45.

That bleſſed man *Wickliffe* ages ago did judge there ought onely to be two Orders of Miniſters, and who theſe be hee expreſſeth in the following words, *viz. Presbyters* and *Deacons*, if there be but two Orders of Miniſters in the Church *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, then where is your Sacred Order of *Epiſcopacie?* And if *Wickliffe* deny the being of that Order, doth hee not contradict it? In the following page he ſaith, *Pauli, &c. That in the time of* Paul, *two diſtinct Orders of Clergie men were ſufficient, Prieſts and Deacons: Neither was there in the time of the Apoſtles any diſtinction of Popes, Patriarchs, Archbiſhops; it was enough that there were Presbyters and Deacons.* *Catalog. Teſt. verit. Tom. 2. Tantum duos ordines miniſtrorum eſſe debere judicavit, viz. Presbyteros & Diaconos.*

So, there is one in this Nation, who before this age contradicts *Epiſcopacie*. *Walſ. Hiſt. Ang. Rich. 2. p. 205.*

Of him alſo *Walſingham* ſaith, That *this was one of* Wickliffs *errours, that every Prieſt rightly ordained, hath ſufficient power to adminiſter all Sacraments*, and conſequently Orders and Penance) for they were then eſteemed Sacraments.

Conſonant to this of *Wickliffe*, was the judgment of *John Lambert*, who in his anſwer to Articles objected againſt him ſaith, thus, *As touching Prieſthood in the Primi-* *Fox Martyrol.*

Primitive Church; when vertue bare (as Ancient Doctors doe deem, and Scripture in mine opinion recordeth the same) moſt room, there were no more officers in the Churches of God then Biſhops and Deacons, that is Miniſters; as witneſſes, beſides Scripture, Hierome *full apertly in his Commentaries upon the Epiſtles of* Paul. Though theſe were but ſingle men, yet they were Martyrs, therefore wee hope their words will beare ſome weight. Wee could tell you further that *Richardus de media Villa in 4. Sent. Diſt. 24. quæſt. 2. Non ordo qui eſt Sacramentum, ſed potius quædam ordinis dignitas Epiſcopatus dicendus eſt*: Epiſcopacie is not to be called order, but a kind of a dignity of an order.

Catal. Teſt. T. 2. *Guil. Occam Anno* 1330 *Quod Sacerdotes omnes cujuſcunq; gradus exiſtant, ſunt æqualis autoritatis, poteſtatis, & juriſdictionis inſtitutione Chriſti: ſed* Cæſaris *inſtitutione Papam eſſe Superiorem, qui etiam poteſt hoc revocare.* That all Prieſts of whatſoever degree they be, are of equall authority, power, and juriſdiction, by the inſtitution of Chriſt: but by *Cæſars* inſtitution the Pope is the Superiour, who may alſo recall this.

We could tell you further of one *Gualter Mapes*, a man whom Hiſtory records famous for Learning, who flouriſht in the yeere 1210, that wrote many books: among the reſt, one called *A Complaint againſt Biſhops.* Another againſt the Pope and his Court. Another to the wicked Prelats. In which he cals the Pope *Plutonem & Aſinum*, Prelats, *Animalia bruta, & ſtercora*: Whether this man did contradict Epiſcopacie or no? let themſelves judge. But we are ſure, if any man a few yeers agoe ſhould have ſo written or ſpoken, it had been a crime next *Læſæ Majeſtatis*: we could

Silveſt. Girald. in ſpecim. Eccleſ. li 3. c 1. & 14. Bal. cent. 3. c. 61.

could tell them of many more, but the *Remonſtrant* deſired but to name any one, we hope we ſhall indifferently well ſatisfie his deſire, by that time we have mentioned one more, *Robert Longland*, a Scholer of *Wickliffs*, who put forth a Book in Engliſh, called the *Ploughmans Dream*, which ends thus,

God ſave the King and ſpeed the plough,
And ſend the Prelates care enough,
Enough, enough, enough, enough.

If ſingle inſtances will not ſerve the turn, wee can give inſtance of a combination of learned and godly men in *Oxford*; who being called in queſtion before the King, and the Biſhops of the Kingdome, were condemned to be ſtigmatized and baniſhed the Kingdome (the fatall puniſhment of the Adverſaries of Epiſcopicie) for ſaying that the Church of *Rome* was the Whore of *Babylon*, the barren fig-tree that God had curſed, and for ſaying, *non obediendum eſſe Papæ & Epiſcopis*, that neither Pope nor Biſhops are to be obeyed. *Math. Pariſ. l. 4. Anno 960.*

If this be not enough, wee can produce the combination of the whole Kingdome, *Anno* 1537 (somewhat above an age ago) out of a Book called, *The inſtitution of a Chriſtian Man*, made by the whole Clergie in their Provinciall Synod, ſet forth by the authoritie of the *Kings Majeſty*, and approved by the whole Parliament, and commanded to be preach't to the whole Kingdome, wherein ſpeaking of the *Sacrament of Orders*, it is ſaid expreſly, that although the Fathers of the ſucceeding Church after the Apoſtles, inſti-

ted certain inferiour degrees of Miniſtery, yet the truth is, that in the New Teſtament, there is no mention made of any other degrees or diſtinction in Orders, but onely of Deacons or Miniſters, and Presbyters or Biſhops, and throughout the whole diſcourſe makes Presbyters & Biſhops the ſame: from whence it is evident, that in that age the whole Clergy knew not any difference made by the Scriptures between Presbyters and Biſhops, and by this time (we hope) you have more then one in this Kingdome, who have contradicted your Epiſcopacie before this age. And if we ſhould expatiate beyond the bounds of this Kingdome, wee might with eaſe produce, not onely teſtimonies of Schoolmen but of others, who acknowledge but two Orders in the Miniſtery; but ſeeing you required onely home-born witneſſes weell trouble you with no other: and intreat you to make much of them. Onely we ſhall intreat the Reader to view, to his abundant ſatisfaction, Doctor *Reinolds* his Epiſtle to Sir *Francis Knowls*, who ſhews out of *Chryſoſtome Hierom*, *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtine*, *Theod. Primaſius*, *Sedulius*, *Theophilact*, that Biſhops and Presbyters are all one in Scripture, and that *Aerius* could be no more juſtly condemned for hereſie, for holding Biſhops and Preſbyters to be all one, then all thoſe Fathers with whom agree (ſaith he) *Oecumenius*, and *Anſelme* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and another *Anſelme*, and *Gregory*, and *Gratian*: and affirms, that it was once enrolled in the Canon Law for ſound and Catholike doctrine, and thereupon taught by learned men, he adds further that it is unlikely that *Anſelme* ſhould have beene Canonized for a Saint by the Pope of *Rome*, and the o-

Quod in novo Teſtamento nulla mentio facta eſt ullorum graduũ, aut diſtinctionum in Ordinibus, ſed tantum Diaconorum vel Miniſtrorum & Presbyterorũ ſive Epiſcoporũ.

ther

ther *Anſelme* and *Gregory* ſo eſteemed in the Popes Library, that *Gratians* Works ſhould be allowed ſo long time by ſo many Popes for the golden fountain of the Canon law, if they had taught that for ſound doctrine, which by the whole Church in her moſt flouriſhing time was condemned for hereſie, and concludes that they who have laboured about the Reformation of the Church, theſe five hundred yeeres (of whom he names abundance) have taught that all Paſtors be they intitulated Biſhops or Prieſts have equall authority and power by the Word of God, and by this the Reader may know Doctor *Reinolds* his judgment concerning Epiſcopacie.

There is one thing more belongs to this Section, as to the proper ſeat, and that is the eſtabliſhment which he ſeeks to Epiſcopacie frō the laws of the Kingdom, to which we having anſwered, that Laws are repealable, the Parliament having a Nomotheticall power, He anſwers *though laws are repealable, yet fundamentall laws are not ſubject to alteration upon perſonall abuſes*: Secondly, that *he ſpeaks not againſt an impoſſibility, but an eaſineſſe of change, which our guiltineſſe would willingly overlook.* Pag. 46.

But conſider, we beſeech you, how fitly is Epiſcopal Government made a piece of the fundamentall Laws of the Kingdome? How did the Kingdome then once ſtand without Biſhops, as in the very page, you had now to anſwer, you might have ſeen once it did? For doth not the Marginall tell you from Sir *Edward Coke*, or rather from an Act reported by him *in the 23 yeere of* Edward *the firſt, that the holy Church was founded in the ſtate of Prelacie, within the Realme of* England, *by the*

King and his progenitors, which *your guiltinesse will needs overlooke*, for feare you should see that there was a King of this Realme of *England*, before there was a *Prelacie*. And how then is Episcopacie one of the fundamentals of the Kingdome? And whereas you say you spake onely against an easinesse of change, read your words in the eighteenth page of your Remonstrance, *A man would thinke it were plea enough to challenge a reverend respect, and an immunitie from all thoughts of alteration*: is this to speake against an easinesse, or rather against a possibility of change? For your conclusion, *that things indifferent or good, having by continuance and generall approbation beene well rooted in Church and State, may not upon light grounds be pulled up*, Good Sir, never trouble your selfe about such an indifferent thing, as *Episcopacie* is. Never feare, but if *Episcopacie* be rooted up, it will be done by such hands as will not doe it upon light grounds.

Sect. V.

THey that would defend the Divine right of *Episcopacie*, derive the pedigree of it from no lesse then *Apostolicall, and in that right, divine institution*; so did this *Remonstrant*. This we laboured in this Section to disprove, and shew, that it might be said of our Bishops, as of those men, *Ezra* 62. *These men sought their Register among those that were reckoned by Genealogie, but they were not found: therefore were they as polluted put from*

from the Prieſthood. For the Biſhops, whoſe pedigree is derived from the Apoſtles, were no others then Presbyters: this we evinced by foure *mediums* out of Scripture, but inſiſted onely upon two, the identitie of their name and office.

Before wee come to the *Remonſtrants* anſwer, wee will minde the Reader of what the *Remonſtrant* ſaith, *That we have a better faculty at gathering then at ſtrewing*: which if we have, we ſhall here make good uſe of our faculty, in gathering the choice flowers which himſelf hath ſcattered; yielding unto us the mayn Scripture grounds whereby the Patrons of Epiſcopacie have endevoured to uphold their cauſe. For himſelfe confeſſeth the Biſhops cauſe to be bad, if it ſtand not by divine Right, and compares the leaving of divine right, and *ſupporting themſelves by the indulgence and munificence of religious Princes*, unto the evill condition of ſuch men, *who when God hath withdrawn himſelfe, make fleſh their arme.* And whether himſelfe hath not ſurrendred up this divine right, judge by that which followeth. Our main argument was, That Biſhops and Presbyters in the originall authority of Scripture were the ſame. Hee anſwers in the name of himſelfe and his Party, *This is in expreſſe terms granted by us.* We argue it further, That we never find in Scripture any other orders of Miniſtery but Biſhops and Deacons. He anſwers, *Brethren, you might have ſpared to tell mee that which I have told you before*, And adds, That when wee alleage *the Apoſtles writings*, for the identity of Biſhops and Presbyters, *we oppoſe not his aſſertion*, becauſe he ſpeaks of *the monuments of immediate ſucceſſion to the Apoſtolike times, but*

Pag. 128.

Pag. 125. The Author of *Epiſc. by divine Right*, affirmes *the ſame part 2. pag. 49.*

Pag. 47.

Pag 47. 48.

we

we of the writings of the Apostles. And for the two other arguments drawn from the identitie of the qualifications of Bishops and Presbyters for their Office, and Ordination to their office, hee answers *Ne vtv quidem.* And yet notwithstanding, that the Reader may not perceive how the Remonstrant betrayes his own cause, he deals like the fish *Sepia*, and casteth out a great deal of black inke before the eyes of the Reader, that so hee may escape without observation. But wee will trace him and finde him out, where hee thinks himselfe most secure. For first, he falsly quotes our answer. Whereas wee say, That in originall authority Bishops & Presbyters are the same, he tels us, we say, That *Bishops and Presbyters went originally for the same*, That is, saith he, *There was at first a plain identity in their denomination.* Which two answers differ, *Immane quantum*! And yet howsoever this very identity of denomination in Scripture is of no small consequence, what ever the Remonstrant makes of it.

For the proper ends of Names being to distinguish things, according to the difference of their natures, and the supream wisdome of God being the imposer of these names, who could neither be ignorant of the nature of these offices, nor mistake the proper end of the imposition of names, nor want variety to expresse himselfe, the argument taken from the constant identity of denomination, is not so contemptible as the Remonstrant pretends. Especially considering that all the texts brought to prove the identity of names prove as intrinsecally, the identity of Offices, which we did cleerly manifest, by that text, *Titus* 1.5,6,7. Where the Apostle requiring Pres-

Presbyters to be thus and thus qualified, renders the reaſon, becauſe Biſhops muſt be ſo. Which argument would no ways evince what the Apoſtle intended, if there were onely an idenditie of names, and not alſo of offices and qualifications When the names are the ſame, and the Offices diſtinct, who but one that cares not what hee affirmes, would infer the ſame offices as a conſequent from the identity of their names? Who would ſay that the properties of the *Conſtellation* called *Canis* ought to be the ſame with the bruit creature ſo called, becauſe they have both one name? And this we deſire the Reader to take the more notice of, becauſe the *Remonſtrant* paſſeth it over in ſilence.

Secondly, the Remonſtrant ſeemes to recant that which he had before granted, & *tels us that though in the Apoſtolike Epiſtles there be no nominal diſtinction of the titles, yet here is a reall diſtinction and ſpecification of the duties, as we ſhall ſee in dūe place.* But this place is in *Vtopia*, and wee ſhall finde it *paulò poſt finem*, for wee finde it no where in this book; but we hope in due place faithfully to performe the contrary to what hee hath deludingly promiſed, and alſo to ſhew how theſe words of his doe contradict what himſelfe ſaith in other places of his book. Pag. 48.

The teſtimonies brought out of antiquities, to ſhew that the names of Biſhops and Presbyters were uſed ἀδιαφόρως, hee calls *trifling*, and challengeth us to *name any one of his Writers that hath ſtood up in the cauſe of Epiſcopacy that hath not granted and proclaimed this which we contend for.* Wee anſwer firſt, the better is our cauſe, when our adverſaries are forced to grant us thus much. Se-

Secondly, the Authours we alleage, doe as well hold the offices of Bishops and Presbyters, to be used in Scripture ἀδιακείτως, as well as the names.

Thirdly, though we cannot name the man, yet hee who names himselfe the *humble Remonstrant*, in the 96 page of his *Defence*, doth impropriate the name ἐπισκόπους, *Acts* 20. to *Bishops* in an imparity distinct from meere Presbyters, saying, *If they were indeed Bishops, and not mere Presbyters as the word it selfe imports*, &c. And wee thinke you should know the name of this man.

We mentioned *Anicetus*, *Pius*, *Higinus*, *Telesphorus*, under the denomination of *Presbyters*. You Answer Pag.48. *we could not have brought a stronger argument against our selves*. Why? They are called *Presbyters* as well as *Bishops*. *Ergo*, the names are used indifferently. Doth Pag.49. it not fully prove as much as we intended? But *they are famously known* (say you) *to have been in a height of elevation above Presbyters*.

It is yet to be proved they were so: yet how ever, no such elevation as did advance them into an order above Presbyterie.

Irenæus lib 4. cap.44. For *Irenæus* speaking of the Successors to the *Apostles* faith, *Cum Presbyterio ordine sermonem sanum & conversationem sine offensâ præstant, ad informationem & correctionem reliquorum*, And our *Remonstrant* granting an identitie of names, and yet thinking to maintain a distinction of offices out of *Irenæus*, comes neerer to the sence of the Popish Commentator *Feuardentius*, then of the orthodox Father *Irenæus*.

Pag.49. To *Cyprian* whom the *Presbyters* called *frater*, Hee replyes *that though the Presbyters were so familiar with him*

as

as to call him brother, yet he did never ſo condiſcend to them as to call them Biſhops, but ſtifly maintains the eminencie of his ſuperiority, and is ſometimes honoured with the ſtile of Beatiſſimus Papa. To all which wee anſwer, firſt, that as the Presbyters call *Cyprian* brother, ſo he cals them *Brethren, Colleagues, Fellow-Presbyters*, &c. And *Auguſtine* a Biſhop, writing to *Hierom* a Presbyter, diſdains not to write in this ſtile, *Domino dilectiſſimo, & in Chriſti viſceribus honorando, ſancto fratri & Compresbytero Hieronymo.* So to *Præſidius, Domino beatiſſimo & merito venerando fratri Conſacerdoti Præſidio*: Yet was *Præſidius* but a Deacon as *Hierome* ſaith. For *Cyprians* maintaining his *Superiority* ſtifly, wee are ſure he never maintained it ſo ſtifly as this *Remonſtrant* and our *Biſhops* doe: for he (as we fully ſhewed in our Anſwer) never maintained any ſole ſuperiour power, but diſclaimed it wholly, yet this is the thing our *Biſhops* contend for, as you may read, *Epiſcopacie by Divine Right, part. 2 pag. 16.*

Ep. 19.

Ep. 16.

Anſw. p 38.

As for the glorious Title of *Beatiſſimus Papa Cyprianus*, we tell you, in that age, it was a title common to Presbyters as well as Biſhops, as appeares *ex Bibliotheca Patrum, Primum, ſingulos habent Papas, ſic enim vocant Presbyteros vel Curiones, in ſingulis Parochiis, cum uno Diacono.* It is therefore but a meere falſe ſuppoſition of the *Remonſtrant*, that the title *Papa* was never given to a meer Presbyter. And we hope the name *Papa* is as great, and *Rome* will ſay as incommunicable, as the *Remonſtrant* would make the name *Epiſcopus*, out of *Cyprian.*

Bib. Pat. Tom. 15. p. 170 de Græcis in Orientalibus ineptis Liturgicis.

Pag. 49.

In the next Paragraph, the *Remonſtrant* leaving the identity of names, addreſſeth himſelf to the great queſtion

stion about the distinction of the Offices of Bishops and Presbyters. And here we demanded, and now demand again, What these men, that maintaine the office of a Bishop distinct from a Presbyter, make the Bishops proper office? Is it to edifie the Church by Word and Sacraments, &c. Here saith the *Remonstrant*, Pag.49. *They fall somewhat unhappily upon the very words of the branded Heretike Aerius.* Good Reader, compare the expressions, and see whether they be the very words: but had we fain upon the very words, how can that man that hath said so often, the Liturgie is never the worse, Pag.24. *because the words of it are taken out of the* Roman Portuise, traduce either our persons or cause, for falling unhappily upon the words of *Aerius*? But it seems he is very willing to take all advantages, to involve us in the crime of Heresie; For in this, and severall other passages, hee chargeth us with being the Disciples of that *frantick Heretike Aerius*, which makes us almost suspect, that great deserving Champion of Episcopacy, *Franciscus à Sancta Clara*, had a hand in this Remonstrance, who hath driven the *Divine right of Episcopacie* so high, as to charge all with heresie that deny it.

So said Sancta of Herom before.

Fran. Sancta Clara. Apol. Epis. pag. 67.68.

But how ever, the Remonstrant should have done well, to have given better satisfaction to our tenth Quere concerning *Aerius*, and taken away what wee spake, before hee cry out against him as *a stigmatized Heretike*. But if hee scorn to answer us, we would intreat him to lend *Bellarmine* a lift in answering the famous Doctor *Whitakers*, *Whitak. contr. 2. Quæst. 5.* who sayes, *I answer*, Aerius *was not accounted by all for an heretike*: Epiphanius *indeed*, and Augustine *following him*, *reckon him among the heretikes*,

tikes, but if he held nothing beſides thoſe things, he was not an heretike, for the Scriptures and Fathers themſelves confirme all theſe: and Theodoret *in his booke of the Fables of the* Jews, *doth not ranke him among heretikes, nor the Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, but rather* Euſtathius *that did oppoſe him*, &c.

If your greatneſſe will not ſtoop to anſwer a ſingle Doctor, we will ſubjoyn a ſecond, Learned Doctour *Willet Contr. Gen.* 5. *Quæſt.* 3. and a third, *Chemnitius in Exam. Concil. Trid. parte* 4. *de Orig. Jejunii*, and a fourth, *Springlius de hodiernis hæreſibus part.* 1. *l.* 3. *c.* 2. which have ſpoken as fully in the juſtification of *Aerius* his opinion, as ever your anſwerers did.

But what ſaith the Remonſtrant to this *Aerian* queſtion? *Brethren, God ſpeed you with your queſtion.* Sir, if you ſpeak this cordially, and ſeriouſly, wee are glad of your ingenuity, that though you have called us *Heretikes*, yet our *hereſie* is not ſo damnable, but you dare beſtow an *Ave* upon us. But if you ſpeak this ſcoffingly, as we are verily affraid you do, then we beſeech you in the feare of God, conſider how you will anſwer this taking of Gods Name in vain, before that great tribunall, to which you make ſuch bold appeals. 2 Iohn 10. 11.

The office wee diſtributed into adminiſtring, *Word* and *Sacraments*, *Orders* and *Diſcipline*. For the firſt, adminiſtring the *Word* and *Sacraments*, this the *Remonſtrant* grants *in common to Biſhops and Presbyters without any difference but what our diſtance makes*: Which exception wee underſtand not, unleſſe your meaning be that Biſhops may preach as often, and as ſeldome as they pleaſe: and wee muſt preach no oftner then they give us leave. Pag. 50.

The *quarrell* as he makes it (we called it *controverſie*)

lies especially in the power of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*; which say wee by divine Authoritie is common to all *Presbyters*, which yet our Bishops have impropriated to themselves. To prove that the power of Ordination was in the hands of Presbyters, wee produced the *1 Tim.* 4.14. to this he answers nothing of his own: onely tels us in an *Hyperbole*, *it hath received answer*, μυκτιμυκτιαμις, and he gives but one, and that borrowed too from *Calvine*, who takes *Presbyterium* of the office, not of the persons. Wherein saith the *Remonstrant he follows the judgment of* Hierome, Primasius, Anselme, Haymo, Lyranus, Erasmus, and others, as Bishop *Downham* hath shewed. Wee doe believe that this is borrowed of Bishop *Downham*, for had he consulted with those Authours, hee might easily have seen how little they favour that exposition. For what saith *Hierome*, whom *Primasius* follows in his very words? *Prophetiæ gratiam habebat cum ordinatione Episcopatus.* Doth this prove that *Presbyterium* is there the name of the office? If so? You must grant *Episcopacie* and *Presbyterie* to be the same office, which is the verie question. But wee would faine know, why *cum ordinatione Presbyterii* or *Episcopatus* should bee understood rather of the office, then of the person: when, (in proprietie of phrase) if they had meant it of the office they would rather have said *ordinatio ad Episcopatum*, then *Episcopatus*. For *Anselme*, what saith hee? *Impositionem manuum eam dicit, quæ in ordinatione ejus facta est, quæ manuum impositio fuit presbyterii, quia per hanc impositionem accepit presbyterium, id est, Episcopatum, vel hæc impositio manuum fuit presbyterii, qui Latinis dicitur Senior, quia ipse Apostolus, qui juxta hunc sensum presby-*

Pag. 51.

ters

ter intelligitur, impoſuit manus ſuas caput ejus dum illum conſecraret Epiſcopum. The comment is a ſufficient confutation of it ſelfe, for the firſt expoſition wracks the text with a violent and unuſuall *hyperbaton.* And therefore hee recedes from that, and falls upon a ſecond, *Presbyterii qui dicitur Senior, quia Apoſtolus ipſe, &c.*

Now what an unlikely expoſition is this? What Authour can theſe followers of *Anſelme* produce, wherein *Preſbyterium* is called *Senior.* For thoſe other, *Lyra, Haymo,* and *Eraſmus,* we will oppoſe to them the Fathers of the *Greek* Church, who are likely to know beſt the genuine ſence of the *Greek* Text.

The ſame Doctor *Downham* (from whom the *defendant* hath borrowed theſe interpretations) tels him that *Chryſoſtome, Theodoret,* and other *Greek* Fathers underſtand it of the perſons, and not of the office.

As for learned *Calvin,* in his Inſtitutions we grant he underſtands it of the office, yet in his Comments (wherein wee may more juſtly expect the full ſenſe of the Text) he compares theſe two interpretations together, and let any Reader judge, which he prefers, *Preſbyterium qui hic Collectivum Nomen eſſe putant pro Collegio Preſbyterorum poſitum,* RECTE SENTIUNT MEO JUDICIO: *Tametſi omnibus expenſis, diverſum ſenſum non malè quadrare fateor, ut ſit nomen officii, Ceremoniam pro ipſo actu ordinationis poſuit. Itaque ſenſus,* Timotheum *cum prophetarum voce aſcitus fuit in Miniſterium, & deinde ſolemni ritu ordinatus, ſimul gratiâ Spiritus Sancti inſtructum fuiſſe ad functionem ſuam exequendam.* Now which ſence doth *Calvin* preferre? Of that which we give, hee ſpeaks poſitively, *Recte ſentiunt.* Of the other, he onely ſaith, *Non malè quadrat.*

And

And that this Text must needs be understood of the persons ordaining, and not of the office *Timothy* was ordained too, will appeare by these reasons.

For first, it cannot stand with the signification of the word τὸ πρεσβυτέριον: The office or dignitie (as le rned Criticks observe) is rather called πρεσβυτερεῖον then πρεσβυτέριον. Nor can it well stand with the sence and construction of the words τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου What shall it be governed of? Would not any Grammarian refer it to τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν, immediatly preceding, rather then to the word χαρίσματος, from which it is so farre dis-joyned. The words in the *Greek* lye thus. *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecie and the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* Now according to the sence the *Remonstrant* strives for, it is thus. *Neglect not the gift of the office of the Presbytery, which was given thee by the laying on of hands.* Bishop *Downham* himselfe, without the bold foysting in (to use the Remonstrants words) of a Parenthesis into the Text, cannot make this interpretation good.

We thought we had sufficiently proved this interpretation in our answer, by producing all the Texts in the new Testament, in which the word πρεσβυτέριον is used, and shewing that in them it signifies the *persons*, and not the *office*, and severall Texts out of *Hierom*, *Ignatius*, & *Concil. Ancyr.* to the same purpose. The Fathers and Councels hee is willing to passe by in silence. The Scripture hee pecks at, and tels us *wee doe meerly delude the Reader*; *For there it is meant of Elders of the people not of the Church* Good Sir, do not you delude your self, & your reader too out of a desire to traduce

Pag. 51.

us.

us. Be they Elders of the people or of the Church, it is ſufficient to prove that πρεσβυτεριον ſignifies not the office of *Preſbyterie*, but the perſons in that office. And this alſo may anſwer that objection, which he makes from the 2 *Tim.* 1.6. For though we grant indeed Maſter *Calvin* was more skilled in the harmony *then our ſelves*, (the *Remonſtrant* might have let it paſſe ſo without putting it among his *Errata*, turning it to *themſelves*) yet wee muſt crave leave herein to diſſent from Maſter *Calvin*, as well as *Beza*, *Cameron*, *Chameir*, and others ſince him have done before us.

And let not the *Remonſtrant* call it *boldnes* in us, to ſay that power of Ordination is communicated to Preſbyters, becauſe *Hierome* and *Concil. Aquiſgr.* ſtill except Ordination, we muſt rather marvell at his boldneſſe in putting that upon us which we ſpake not: wee ſay indeed, *pag.* 24. of our anſwer, it was in the hands of Presbyters. The Remonſtrant would have us ſay Communicated to Presbyters, that wee might ſeeme to acknowledge the power of Ordination to be originally in Biſhops, and in Presbyters onely by derivation from them, which we never meant; and if we ever did uſe the word Communicated, it was onely to note a Community in that power, not a derivation of it: as for his authors which he alleages for ſole Ordination, let the Reader pleaſe to view our anſwer, *pag.* 37.38. wherein hee may receive full ſatisfaction, and the rather becauſe the Remonſtrant paſſeth over it. The third part of that office which the Biſhops call theirs, is *ruling*. To prove this to belong to Presbyters as well as Biſhops, we cite *Heb.* 13.17. Here the Remonſtrant cryes out, *Oh injurious imputation! do wee not give*

you

you the title of Rectores Ecclesiarum? And doe we not commit to you regimen Animarum? So then you grant this place is rightly both interpreted and applied; *but you give us*, say you, the title *of rectores Animarum, & regimen Animarum. You give us?* No, it is the Scripture gives it us: yet you would assume it to your selves, and perswade, that as the Pope communicates to his Bishops *partem solicitudinis*, so you to us Presbyters: but if the Scriptures gave us no more then you do, it would prove δεῦτερον ψεῦδος. You make your selves *the sole Pastors*, us *but the Curates*; *your selves, Chancellours, Officials, the sole Judges*, us but the executioners of your and their sentences, whether just or unjust.

Pag. 53.

This Text is brought by a late Writer for Episcopacy, to prove that as yet there were no bishops over Presbyters in the Church of the Apostles, And for this purpose he brings *Hierome* upon the same text, affirming the same thing.

The other Text 1 *Thes.* 5. 12. and those four things observed from thence for the confirming of this assertion, the *Remonstrant* passeth over: so hee doth our argument which was this, They which have the same *name*, the *same Ordination* to their office, the *same qualification* for their office, the *same work*, to feed the flock of God, to ordain Pastors and Elders, to rule and governe, they are one and the same. But such are Bishops and Presbyters. *ergo.* And thus deals hee also with the two quotations, the one of the Councell of *Aquisgra.* the other out of the writing of *Smalcald*; all which being to hard for the Remonstrant to evade, hee leaps over to a conclusion of such strange things, as hee never went about to prove in his Section.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

HAving from Scripture manifeſted the Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters in their originall inſtitution; we applied our ſelves in this ſection to finde out the authors and occaſion of this imparity which now appeares between them.

To expedite our ſelves from needleſſe controverſies, we laid downe three particulars, as conſented to by both ſides: Firſt, that the firſt and beſt antiquity uſed the names of Biſhops and Presbyters promiſcuouſly; this the Remonſtrant ſubſcribes to. Secondly, that in proceſſe of time ſome one was honoured with the name of Biſhop, the reſt were called Presbyters: this the Remonſtrant quarrels, and *deſires to know what was this proceſſe of time, chargeth us either with error or fraud, confidently defends this time had no proceſſe at all, but was in the very πρῶτον of the living Apoſtles, and undertakes to make this good in the ſequell.* And how he doth that, you ſhall find in this very ſection page 59. where to that of *Hierom, The Presbyters governed the Church by their common Councel*, he anſwers, *So they did doubtleſſe altogether, till Epiſcopacy was ſetled, who dare deny it?* Page 55.

Here the Remonſtrant grants a proceſſe of time betweene the planting of the Church by the Apoſtles, and the ſetling of Epiſcopacy in the Churches Shall we ſay now this is the Remonſtrants either errour or fraud, not to ſet downe how long it was before Epiſcopacy was ſetled in the Church? let him take heed another time how he charge men with error or fraud,

for affirming that which himselfe cannot but give his Suffrage to.

The third thing agreed upon was, that this was not *nomen inane*, an idle title, but attended upon with some kind of imparity: the question was digested into these tearmes. *Whether the impropriation of the name, and the imparity of the place and power of a Bishop be of divine right?* The Remonstrant for feare of mistaking, desires to explicate the tearmes of the question, and therefore tels, how fetching the pedegree of *Episcopacy from Apostolicall (and therefore in that right divine institution.)* he interprets himselfe to understand *by divine right,* Page 55. *not any expresse Law of God, requiring it as of absolute necessity to the being of a Church, but an institution of the Apostles inspired by the holy Ghost, warranting it where it is, and requiring it where it may be had*; but, *Nihil infelicius Retorico definiente*: the Remonstrant if he would avoyd mistaking, or at least would not say that he was mistaken, should have dealt a little more clearely and punctually in the stateing of the Question.

For first he tels us, that it is an *institution of the Apostles inspired by the Holy ghost*: if the Remonstrant be not Def. p. 56. here mistaken why doth he page 47. in expresse terms grant us, that in *originall authority of Scripture, Bishops and Presbyters were originally the same.* For so were our words, not as the Remonstrant reports them, *went for the same:* and why againe, when we tell him we never finde in Scripture these three orders, *Bishops, Presbyters & Deacons* (we say not the names, but orders) why doth he grant that in the same page, and flie from the writings of the Apostles to the monuments of their immediate successers? can we imagine that the Apostles did by

by inſpiration from the holy Ghoſt, ordaine any thing in the Church of God as of perpetuall uſe; the record whereof is not found in ſacred Scripture, which was given by the ſame inſpiration to the ſame men; if we may imagine it, ſure we cannot beleeve it. And if it be an inſtitution of the Apoſtles inſpired by the holy Ghoſt, why muſt it be diſtinguiſhed from the expreſſe law of God? doth he make it but an evangelicall counſell; *not requiring it as neceſſary to the being of a Church*; ſure this is ſome opinion of a newer cut; for the laſt defendant of Epiſcopacy before this Remonſtrant ſaies thus, *The power of Ordination hath beene ever held ſo intrinſecall to Epiſcopacy, that I would faine ſee, where it can be ſhewed that any extremity of neceſſity was ever acknowledged a warrant ſufficient for others to ordaine.* So that in his judgement, where there is no Biſhop, there can be no lawfull ordination, let it be in the caſe of extreameſt neceſſity; and where no ordination, no miniſtery, and ſo conſequently no Word and Sacraments, and no Church: and how then in the judgement of theſe men is Epiſcopacy not required to the being of a Church?

Epiſcop. by divine right, part 2. p. 91.

And if *not requiring it to the being of a Church*, how then? *requiring it onely where it may be had:* what a ſtrange limitation is this? where is it that Epiſcopacy may not, muſt not be had, if it be an ordinance of Chriſt? where is it that the Churches of Chriſt may not have Word, Sacraments, Paſtors and Biſhops too, if they be his ordinance? It is true indeed, ſome there are that cannot have Lord Biſhops, pompous Biſhops, and once a Canon provides that they ſhould not be in little Villages, *Ne vileſceret honos Epiſcopatus*: but theſe

Can. Sardic. can. 6.

himſelfe acknowledgeth, are *but the acceſſaries* of Epiſcopacy by *the donations of Magnificent Princes*. But what is the meaning of this, *where it may be had?* what doth he meane, where it may be had with the favour of the Prince? then the Primitive Church had never had any. Or where it may be had with the willing ſubjection of the people? then Epiſcopacy ſhall be an ordinance, if the people will have it ſo. *Where it may be had*; what? with quiet and conveniency? then you make that which you call an ordinance of God ſubject to mans convenience. Or what? with poſſibility? requiring that where Epiſcopacy may be had poſſibly, it ſhould? what's this leſſe than a command? yet ſaith the Remonſtrant, here is no expreſſe law of God requiring it. Now we pray you review your worke, and ſee how well you have ſtated the queſtion.

To prove that Epiſcopacy was not a divine, but a humane inſtitution; we produced out of antiquity ſome places, that mention the occaſion and authors of Epiſcopall imparity, which are not (as the Remonſtrant abſurdly) *the onely countenance of our cauſe*.

Our firſt was, that knowne text of *Hierome* in the 1. *Titus*, out of which we collected five things, which the Remonſtrant ſummes up thus: *Firſt, that a Biſhop and a Presbyter are originally one. Secondly, that the imparity was grounded upon Eccleſiaſticall cuſtome. That before this priority, the Church was governed by the common Councell of Presbyters, and that Biſhops ought ſtill ſo to governe. And laſtly, that the occaſion of this imparity was the diviſion, which through the divels inſtinct fell among Chriſtians: this the Remonſtrant cals the ſumme of our collection.* But if his Arithmeticke be no honeſter then thus, he ſhall

Page 56.

ſumme

summe no summes for us; for he leaves out one Collection which is indeed principally considerable, *That this was not Hieromes owne opinion, but the opinion of the scriptures.* This would have stopt the mouth of his *satis imperitè.* Wel what saies the Remonstrant? *You look now that I should tell you the booke is of uncertaine credit.* No indeed sir, we looked for no such matter; because we know that booke is approved by men both of as great learning and of as little affection to *Hieromes* opinion as the Remonstrant is, though his lesser commentaries on the epistles be questioned. *Or else you look, that I should tell you Hierome was a Presbyter, and not without some touch of envy to that higher dignity which he missed.* Truely sir, this we looked for, and the rather because Doct. *Hall* in his *Episcopacy by Divine right, part* 2. *page* 122. saith, that as *he was naturally a waspish, & a hot good man, so being now vexed with some crosse proceedings, as he thought, with John of Jerusalem, he flew out, &c.* but what a slender answer is this; *Hierome* was a Presbyter, what then? *Hierome* saith nothing here, but what he saith from Scripture; and is Scripture the lesse Scripture because produced by a Presbyter? *Hierome* was a Presbyter, and pleads for his owne order; doth that make his argument the lesse creditable? the author of *Episcopacy by Divine right* was a Bishop; is it sufficient confutation of that booke to say hee was a Bishop that made it, he must plead for his own honour and order? *Or you looke, say you, that I should tell you that wiser men then your selves have censured him in this point of Arrianisme.* No indeed, for feare you should thereby comfort us against the same censure past so often upon our selves. If *Hierome* suffer under the name of

Bellar. de Script. Eccles.

Aerian, no wonder we doe: but if wiſer men than we have condemned him for Aerianiſme, wiſer men then the Remonſtant have quitted him of that crime.

But the Remonſtrant thinkes to decline theſe common waies, and ſet *Hierome* to anſwer *Hierome*; which yet is no more then *Bellarmine* did before him; and and puts us in mind that the ſame father paſſes a *ſatis imperitè* upon the ſame opinion in the Biſhop of Hieruſalem; but *a ſatis imperitè* doth not condemne the opinion, but the man; for it may be truth which a man ſpeakes, though he ſpeakes it *imperitè*: yet to make ſure worke the *Remonſtrant will ſet Hierome to anſwer himſelfe: what ſaith Hierome? at firſt ſaith he, Biſhops and Presbyters had but one title*: No, *Hierome* ſaid not ſo, nor did we. *Idem eſt ergo Presbyter qui Epiſcopus*: How doth the Remonſtrant conſtrue this? Is this in Engliſh, a Biſhop and a Presbyter is the ſame: or is it, *at firſt Biſhops and Presbyters had but one title*? with what face can the Remonſtrant charge us with infidelity in quotation and miſ-engliſhing, who uſeth no more fidelity himſelfe? that which *Hierome* ſpeakes of the office, he would reſtraine to the title; that which *Hierome* ſpeakes in the preſent tenſe, as true in all the moments and fluxes of time, he would remit to the time paſt; *They had but one title*; This the Remonſtrant paſſeth from, and ſlips from their Identity to their imparity; inquiring the time and occaſion of that, and will needs force *Hierome* here to confeſſe *Biſhops in the Apoſtles daies: becauſe then they began to ſay, I am of Paul, &c.* but will take no notice at all of what our anſwer ſpake for the removing of this inference, unleſſe it be to ſlight it, *as a poore ſhift*: nor will take notice of that

Page 57.

which

which *Hierome* himſelfe ſpeakes. *Hæc propterea aut oſtenderemus apud veteres eoſdem fuiſſe Presbyteros quos & Epiſcopos: paulatim verò ut diſſentionum plantaria evellerentur, ad unum omnem ſolicitudinem eſſe delatam:* intimating that Episcopacy was not presently invented as a cure of ſchiſme, but *paulatim*: ſo that ſhould it be granted, that the ſchiſmes ſpoken of here were thoſe in the Apoſtles daies, yet it doth not follow, that Epiſcopacy ſhould be coætaneous to theſe ſchiſmes, becauſe *Hierome* ſaith, *Paulatim ad unum omnem ſolicitudinem eſſe delatam.* Let the Remonſtrant now aske *Hierome*, not us; why the remedy ſhould be ſo late after the diſeaſe? and here we deſire the reader to obſerve that the Remonſtrant doth meerely abuſe him in telling him that *Clemens in his Epiſtle to the Corinthians taxeth the continuance of the diſtractions raiſed in the Apoſtles daies:* when it is apparent that Clement ſpeakes of a new ſchiſme different from that *Paul* ſpeakes of, raiſed againſt ther Presbyters, and the former ſchiſme mentioned in the Scripture was onely among the people. As for thoſe Biſhops whom *Hierome* names as made by the Apoſtles, at preſent we ſay no more, but this: *Hierome*, as a Divine ſaith, *Biſhops and Presbyters are the ſame*; and to prove this produceth Scripture: but *Hierome* ſpeaking as an Hiſtorian, mentions Biſhops made by the Apoſtles, and brings no Scripture for the proofe of that, but onely the teſtimony of *Euſebius* his hiſtory, who alone had writ before him of that ſubject: Now let the Chriſtian Reader judge whether more credit be to be given to *Hierome* as an Hiſtorian quoting humane Hiſtory, or to *Hierome* as a Divine quoting Scriptures. And yet what can be brought to prove

Def. 58.

Ierom de Scriptoribus Eccleſ.

prove that those Bishops were not the same with Presbyters?

For the diabolicall occasion of bringing in Episcopacy into the Church: if there be any fault in the phrase, it is *Hieromes*, not ours: therefore the *weaknes and absurdity is flung in the face of that waspish, hot good man Hierome*, not in ours.

The institution of Episcopacy, Hierome saith, was rather *by the custome of the Church then by the truth of the Lords disposition*; to avoyd the stroke of which, the Remonstrant would faine perswade *Hierome* to owne that, which in the judgement of *Belarm. Spalato*, and almost as many as have writ before the Remonstrant, never entered into his thoughts; nor can be the proper meaning of his words; *That by the custome of the Church, the father meanes the Church Apostolique, and by the Lords disposition, Christs immediate institution.*

This were to make *Hierome* of their mind. How well this may be done, let their sworne friend *Spalato* give his verdict. *Sunt qui Hieronymum in rectam sententiam vel invitum velint trahere*; one of these must this *Remonstrant* be.

Page 59. As for that passage of *Hierome ad Euagrium*, where he saies, *this superiority of Bishops above Presbyters is by Apostolicall tradition*, *Hierome* in that Epistle sharpens his reproofe against some Deacons, that would equallize themselves to Presbyters; an opinion which the Remonstrant thinks more reasonable, then that Presbyters should be equall to Bishops: to make this reproofe the stronger he saith, *Presbyter is id est, Episcopus*

In his defence, p. 125. and a little after, he doth out of the Scripture most manifestly prove *eundem esse Presbyterum atque Episcopum*

pum : and carries this proofe by *Paul*, by *Peter*, and by *Iohn* the longeſt ſurviver of the *Apoſtles*: then adde, *quod autem poſtea unus electus qui cæteris præponeretur, in ſchiſmatis remedium factum. The reaſon why afterwards one was elected, and ſet over the reſt was the cure of ſchiſme.* It is hard to conceive how this imparity can be properly called an Apoſtolicall tradition when *Hierome* having mentioned *Iohn* the laſt of the Apoſtles, ſaith it was *poſtea afterwards* that one was ſet over the reſt, yet ſhould we grant it an Apoſtolicall tradition in *Hieromes* ſenſe, it would be no prejudice to our cauſe, ſeeing with him *Apoſtolicall tradition* and *Eccleſiaſticall cuſtome* are the ſame; witneſſe that inſtance of the obſervation of *Lent*, which he writing *ad Marcellum* ſaith, is *Apoſtolica traditio*; yet writing *adverſus Luciferianos*, ſaith it is *Eccleſiæ conſuetudo*; whereby it fully appeares that *Hierome* by Apoſtolicall tradition meant not an Apoſtlicall inſtitution, but an eccleſiaſticall cuſtome, and ſo much we granted *Epiſcopacie* to have.

Hierome ſaith *toto orbe decretum eſt, and it was decreed all the world over (ſay you) in the time of the firſt diviſions. Hierome* ſaid not ſo (ſay we) but after theſe diviſions, not in the time of theſe firſt diviſions. Is this faithfull tranſlating? *By what power, ſay you, beſides Apoſtolicall could it be decreed ſo ſoone and ſo univerſally?* But how if it were decreed neither ſoone nor univerſally? If we may believe *Hierome*, it was neither ſoone nor at once; but *paulatim* by little and little, not by Apoſtolicall decree, but by the cuſtome of the Church.

Hierome ſaith, *the Presbyters governed the Church by their Canon Councell.* So they did, ſaith the *Remonſtrant*,

ſtrant, altogether till Epiſcopacy was ſetled, who dare deny it? ſure hee dares deny it, who in the 55. page of his defence, chargeth us with errour and fraud, for ſaying that *though at firſt the name and office of a Biſhop and Preſbyter was the ſame, yet in proceſſe of time ſome one was honoured with the name of Biſhop*; and confidently defends *that this time had no proceſſe, but was the very τὸ νῦν of the living Apoſtles:* but how his τὸ νῦν *there without any proceſſe of time*, can ſtand with his *donec* here; and with *Hieromes paulatim, poſtquam, poſtea*, let him ſee to that. *Hierome* ſaith *they ought ſo to governe ſtill*: ſo (ſaith
Page 19. the Remonſtrant) *ſay we alſo, and ſo in ſome caſes they do.* Good ſir, and why not in all caſes? *Church government, you ſay, is Ariſtocraticall.* True, when it is in the hands of the beſt men, then it is ἀριστοκρατία. But when the men in whoſe hands the government of the Church is, are bad; then it is πονηροκρατία, or Kakiſtocraticall. But our preſent Church government is not *Ariſtocraticall*, but *Monarchicall:* becauſe not onely one Biſhop Lords it over his Dioceſſe, but alſo one Primate appoints to all other Biſhops. Beſides, if it were *Ariſtocraticall*, then ought every Miniſter to be a member of that Ariſtocracy; for certainely no man will account the Miniſter *de plebe:* in the judgement not onely of the ancient Fathers, but of reaſon it ſelfe, none can be accounted *plebs* but the Laicks; ſeing e-
Iob 33.23. very Miniſter is elected *optimatim, and is as one of a thouſand:* Next you tell us *there is no Biſhop ſo abſolute, as not to be ſubject to the judgement of a Synod.* It is much he ſhould not, when all the fixed members of our Synod are the Biſhops meere dependants, & ſuch packing uſed in the choice of the reſt, as perhaps worſe was not at the Councell of Trent. Thus

Thus all the art the Remonſtrant hath cannot perſwade *Hierome* to befriend our Biſhops in his judgement; and is it not ſtrange boldneſſe to perſwade the Reader that *Hierome* ſhould againſt his judgement befriend them in his hiſtory?

After the allegation, we produced ſome reaſons to ſhew, that though it ſhould be granted theſe were in the times of the Apoſtles, yet the Invention of Biſhops for the taking away of theſe ſchiſmes is not Apoſtolicall: our arguments the Remonſtrant, according to his greatneſſe cals *poore negative arguments*, which yet we entreat the Reader to view for his further ſatisfaction, and remember that in *Sacrâ Scripturâ locus tenet ab authoritate, negativè*. And good ſir, *how doe we in them goe about to Confute our owne Authors?* what do theſe reaſons conclude more, but that Biſhops were neither of Divine, nor Apoſtolicall inſtitution, and what doth *Hierome* ſay leſſe? Tell not us of ſtriking our own friend, let him ſuffer as an Hieronymomaſtix, that when *Hierome* croſſes his opinion, cals him a *waſpiſh hot-good man*. Page 60.

In the next place you look'd for Ambroſe: yet you might have taken notice that we ſpake but of the *Cõmentaries that goe under the name of Ambroſe*; which if you call a foyſt, all your owne ſide are as guilty as our ſelves, that cite him as well as we, and ſome for *Ambroſe*; how ever this is much leſſe then your ſelfe did in point of Liturgie. Where we deſiring to ſee ſome Liturgies not Spurious, you produced the Liturgy of *James*, &c. Def. p. 61. Divn. def. 3. lib. cap 4. pa. 80.

For the perſons that brought in this Imparity, we tell you, they were the Presbyters; and prove this from *Hierome*

Page 62. *ad Euagrium. The Presbyters of Alexandria did call him their Bishop, whom they had chosen from among themselves, and placed in a higher degree.* This you call a *faithlesse and a halved citation*: Good sir, be not so harty, its neither false, nor halved: not false, because it fully proves the thing for which wee brought it, which was, that the advancing of one to an eminency and superiority above the rest was not a divine, but a humane act; it was not God, but man that was the authour of this imparity; and doth not the place fully prove this? *Presbyteri unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant*, and say we any more? Nor is it halved, though hee saith this was done *a Marco Evangelista, usque ad Heraclam*: yet this concerned not the purpose for which the text was quoted, and therefore might warrantably be omitted, especially having proved before that, which the Remonstrant would perswade his reader we are shie of here, that Bishops were not in the Apostles times: and if the leaving out a few words in a quotation, not pertinent to the question, be the halving of it, how will the Remonstrant cleare himselfe of this sinne, who citing the Councell of Laodicea p. 15. makes bold to leave out a great deale more then we did here: where a most materiall passage was omitted, as before we have observed. Neither did we leave out *a Marco Evangelista*, for feare it should prove that there were Bishops as earlie as the Corinthian schisme. Nor

Page 62. did *our hearts tell us that Marke died many yeeres within the Apostles time*; for *Irenæus* tels us *lib.* 3. *Contra Hæres.* that hee writ his Gospell after *Peter* and *Pauls* death. That which wee quoted proves abundantly that the Pres-

Presbyters both choſe and placed one of the Presbytersin a higher degree, by their own authority, giving him both the degree and the name. Doe you (who brought in *A Marco Evangeliſtâ* to trouble your reader and to ſlander us) reconcile if you can, Authors about the time of his death.

But the laſt place he bringeth out of *Hierom*, is a moſt rare place, *and may well make any man wonder with what face we can ſay, Hierome ever ſpake againſt Biſhops:* and why ſo? becauſe *Hierome* ſaith, *Epiſcopacy is Gods owne worke:* where is it? in *Iſa.* 60. 17. what are the words? *Hierome* reading that text according to the 72 tranſlation, ſaies: *Ponam inquit, Principes tuos in pacem, & Epiſcopos tuos in juſtitiam, in quo,* ſaith *Hierome, Scripturæ ſanctæ admiranda Majeſtas, quod Principes futuros Eccleſiæ Epiſcopos nominavit, quorum omnes viſitatio in pace eſt, &c.* herein the majeſty of the Scripture is to be admired, which hath named the future Princes of the Church, Biſhops; all whoſe viſitations are in peace. Good reader, conſider this mighty mouth-ſtopping argument. God hath promiſed the Princes of the Church ſhall be as Biſhops. *Ergo*, Biſhops in imparity are Gods owne worke: good ſir, your **Baculus in angulo* take to your ſelfe againſt you walke to finde texts againe in *Hierome* to prove Biſhops to be of divine inſtitution. Page 63. * Page 77.

The reſt of your quotations out of *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Chryſoſtome*, they are places have beene oft alleaged, and as oft anſwered: wee will be briefe with you. For if you had not lyen hid under the equivocation of the word *Epiſcopi*, you might have ſpared your ſelfe and us a labour. Theſe *Epiſcopi* were *Presbyteri*, you your ſelfe grant that their names were

common in the dayes of *Linus*, *Polycarpe*, and *Ignatius*, which are the men you here cite for Bishops. And therefore unlesse you can shew that they had a superiority of power over Presbyters, such as ours have; you doe but delude the Reader with a grosse Homonymie, whom we referre to a passage in learned *Iunius. controv. 3. lib. 2. c 5. not. 18.* In which he labours to remove the contradictions of Historians concerning the order of succession of the Romane Bishops, *Linus*, *Clemens*, *Anacletus &c.* And he saith, That these or some of these were Presbyters or Bishops of Rome at the same time, ruling the Church in common. But the following writers, fancying to themselves such Bishops as then had obtained in the Church, fell into these snares of tradition, because they supposed, according to the custome of their owne times, that there could be but one Bishop in one Church at the same time: which is quite crosse to the Apostolicall times.

To that of *Ambrose* calling *Iames* Bishop of *Ierusalem*, we gave a sufficient answer in our former Booke page 51. out of Doct. *Raynolds*; and shall (God willing) adde more in due place.

Page 64. *Our Ship* as you tell us, *talkes of a councell*; No more ours then yours, for your party can, when hee speakes for them, vouch him with much more confidence then we doe. *But what saith this Ship?* he *talkes of a councell as false as himselfe.* Why? because the Nicene was the first generall Synod: but yet there were provinciall Councels before. And the Commentaries mentioned before doe not say it was done by a generall Councell, but onely by a Councell; though you by subtle coupling this Councell and *Hieromes toto orbe decretum*

decretum erat, would faine force him to this ſence: which *toto orbe decretum eſt* implies no Apoſtolicall act, nor act of a generall Councell neither, as we have ſhewed before. And yet this we tell you, the Nicene was the firſt Councell, in which *toto orbe decretum erat* that there ſhould be but one Biſhop in a City.

As for Saint *Auſtin* his phraſe, that the originall of Epiſcopacy above Presbytery was onely *ſecundum uſum Eccleſiæ, you ſay it was but a modeſt word, and it is a juſt wonder that we dare cite him.* Well, let us put it to the triall; *Hierome* having taken diſtaſte at *Auguſtine*, writes two ſharpe Epiſtles to him, in both which Epiſtles he doth extoll *Auguſtine* ironically as a great man, becauſe hee was in *pontificali culmine Conſtitutus* advanced to Epiſcopall dignity, and ſpeakes of himſelfe as a poore, contemptible underling: to which *Auguſtine* anſwering among other things ſaith thus: *Rogo ut me fideliter corrigas, ubi mihi hoc opus eſſe perſpexeris: quanquam enim ſecundum honorum vocabula quæ Eccleſiæ uſus obtinuit, Epiſcopatus Presbyterio major eſt: tamen in multis Auguſtinus Hieronymo minor. This was Auguſtines modeſty ſay you.* Well, and had not *Auguſtine* beene as modeſt, if he had left out that phraſe *quæ Eccleſiæ uſus obtinuit?* his modeſty appeares in theſe words, *tamen in multis Auguſtinus Hieronymo minor*; not in the former. In the diminution of his perſon, not of his calling. S. *Paul* knew how to ſpeake humbly of himſelfe, yet highly of his office, and ſo might *Auſtin*; and if he had known that the majority of *Biſhops* above *Presbyters* had beene of Divine, or Apoſtolicall inſtitution, he might have ſaid ſo much; and not have beene the leſſe modeſt, but the more; nay hee would have ſaid ſo much. *Quis enim*

Page 64.

Epiſt. 11. 13.

Rom. 11. 13.

Auguſt. contra Maxim. Arian. Epiſc. Lib. 2. *Auguſt. de verbo Ap. ſec. 29.*

enim eſt humilitatis fructus ubi detrimentum eſt veritatis? What profit is there in humility with the loſſe of truth. And he that could tell another *non accipiet Deus mendacem humilitatem tuam, God will not accept of your lying humility*, could tell himſelfe as much. So then though it be in *humilitate perſonæ* that he ſaith, *Auguſtinus Hieronymo minor eſt*, yet it is in *veritate rei* that hee ſaith *Secundum honorum vocabula quæ Eccleſiæ uſus obtinuit, Ep. ſcopatus Presbyterio Major eſt.* Thus much for *Auguſtines* modeſty. And as for the *Herauldry* in blazoning *Aerius* for an heretick falſely objected *ad nauſeam uſque & uſque*, We referre to former anſweres.

Page 65.

The *Remonſtrant* will put us and the Readers to more trouble in the next place, becauſe he calles our fidelity into ſo deepe queſtion about the quotation of *Gregory Nazianzen, Orat.* 28. Where the father is muſtering up the armies of evils that might ſeeme to threaten him, ſhewing the invincible magnanimity of his Spirit more then conquering, contemning all: Among thoſe evils he reckons his ejection out of his Epiſcopacy: which what ever others would eſteeme, he counts as nothing, and held it a principall part of wiſedome in that age to ſhunne it, and then wiſhes μηδὲ ἦν πρωτεῖα *utinam nulla ſit princeps dignitas*, that there were no principall dignity (to wit, in the Church) of which he is ſpeaking. Secondly, he wiſhes μηδὲ τὸν τόπου πρωτίμους ἢ τυραννικὴν πρωτομίαν, that there were no dignity or tyrannicall prerogative of place, that they might be knowne onely by vertue: to which belongs that *Dextrum & ſiniſtrum*, thoſe challenges of places of which the *Remonſtrant* ſpeaks. All which he ſpeaks upon ſuppoſall of the loſſe of his Epiſcopacy. And for that

Suidas tels us ἡ πρωτεῖα was a principall place ἄλλοις φιλοπρώτου ἡ πρωτεῖα, *aliis ſtudio eſt princeps locus*, & he cals him πρωτοκάθεδρος *qui primam tenet ſedem* εἰς πρωτοκαθεδρίαν πρωτόλειον *eſt ſedibus primis vel honoribus primis dignari.*

that *Dextrũ & ſiniſtrum*, *Balſamon* ſaith it was the manner of their diſtinguiſhing of the place of Biſhops, according to their ſeniority and this occaſioned thoſe competitions among Biſhops of which he ſpeakes. The *Series* of this diſcourſe is long, we muſt not inſert it all: but let the learned reader vouchſafe to view it at larg, and if it doe not appeare that wee have alledged the place according to the genuine ſence of the Authour, let us in his thoughts lie under all the reproaches, which our virulent Remonſtrant labours to caſt upon us in his whole book. However the Remonſtrant hath little cauſe to reproach *Nazianzen* with that ſcoffe of his Egyptian adverſaries τεννίσιον, as if he had out of an ambitious humour changed his ſeat: when he that peruſeth his life ſhall finde, it would be an eaſier matter to remove an Engliſh Biſhop from one Biſhopricke to another till hee come to Canturbury, then it was to remove *Nazianzen* from one place to another. And as little reaſon with open mouth to fall upon us, and bid us eate our words, for ſaying that if *our Biſhops will deduce their pedegree from the Apoſtles time in an uninterrupted line unto this day*, they muſt draw the line of their pedigree through the loynes of Antichriſt: we tell him againe, let him take it never ſo angerly: What ever Biſhops have beene in other places beſides Rome, if our Biſhops will draw their pedegree from the Apoſtles, they muſt draw it through Antichriſts loynes.

Balſam. in Can. 89. Conc. Carthagin.

Page 66.

SECT. VII, VIII.

IN this seventh Section the Remonstrant hath cut us out little worke: so much of our answer as he is loth to meddle with, he balkes under the tearmes of *idle words*. The rest concerning the election of former Bishops, hee seemes to consent to in opinion and option: onely that the shortest Section may not be closed without more frumps then one, he tels us *we are besides the Cushion*. The *objection was, that the Apostles Bishops, and ours were two in respect of mannaging their functions*. The Remonstrant will give us leave (we hope) to forme our owne objection. *He* makes it indeed *of the Apostles Bishops. We* having proved *no Bishops (ut nuncupantur* as they are now tearmed) Apostolicall. Bring it downe to the *Bishops of inferiour times*. *He* (as here he tels us) spake onely of the difference betweene the one and the other in managing of their function. We intending to present the differences betweene ours and former Bishops fully to *view*; instance not onely in the managing of their function, but in their election and accessories; *and is this to be beside the Cushion?* This first point of difference our Remonstrant grants, that our Bishops and former differ in their election.

Page 68.

Page 69. And he makes haste from hence to follow *us into the execution of their Episcopall office*. We make as much haste to meet him, and make good what we formerly layed downe, that our Bishops and the Bishops of former times are two: First, in the *sole jurisdiction* they assume to themselves, which *former Bishops* never did, nor

nor durſt; which *juriſdiction* (being taken here in a large ſenſe for the execution of all Epiſcopall power) we diſtributed into the *adminiſtration of orders and cenſures*, *which* (ſaith the Remonſtrant) * *in all wiſe writers were wont to be contradiſtinguiſhed. Diſtinguiſhed* they are we grant, and ſo did we diſtinguiſh them, page 24,25. of our anſwer, which the wiſedome of the Remonſtrant might have taken notice of and forborne this ſcorne. Yet not ſo *contradiſtinguiſhed*, but that *the power of ordination* may be reckoned as a *part of Epiſcopall juriſdiction*; taking that word *juriſdiction* (which was unknowne to firſt antiquity) for the *whole execution of Epiſcopall power*, as the Remonſtrant here takes it.

* And yet the wiſe writer of this Defence did not contradiſtinguiſh them in his defence, p. 78. where he expreſſes ordination under ſpirituall juriſdiction.

The firſt of theſe, *the ſole power of ordination; and the ſole exerciſe of that power, which was a ſtranger, and a monſter to former times. This our Biſhops* aſſume *to themſelves*, and herein differ *from the former Biſhops*. The latter of theſe he grants, *That Biſhops of former times did not aſſume to themſelves the ſole exerciſe of ordination. Onely he* cannot let us paſſe; *without his uſuall curteſie.* But the former he denies, *the ordination is* (*he ſaith*) *the Biſhops, but the ſole in that ſence we uſe it, is ours. Biſhops did never challenge it nor practice it*, we will waſh off all this; and ſhew firſt that our Engliſh Biſhops have challenged to themſelves this ſole power, and have practiſed this power, and then make good our quotation: and when this is done, let it be tryed not *who can bluſh*, but who *hath more reaſon to bluſh; the Remonſtrant, or his anſwerers.*

Page 70.

For the firſt: *that Biſhops challenge to themſelves ſole power of ordination.* We did never thinke that in theſe

knowing times we ſhould have beene put to prove the Snow is white, or the Crow blacke. But ſeeing the Remonſtrant will have it ſo, we will ſhew firſt out of *Epiſcopacy by Divine right*, part 2. Sect. 15. the title of which Section is this, *power of ordination is ONELY in Biſhops*: and in the beginning of the Section he ſaith, *This was one of the Acts that was APPROPRIATED to Biſhops ALONE*: and is not this to challenge *ſole power of ordination?* afterwards in the ſame Section, he ſaith, *Ordination is one of the things ſo Intrinſecall to Epiſcopacy*, that in the judgement of the Church, no extremity of Neceſſity was ſufficient warrant to diffuſe it into other hands. The ſame power of ordination doe Biſhop *Bilſon*, *Andrewes*, *Davenant*, *Mountague*, *&c.* challenge to Epiſcopacy. Now Reader judge, is the *ſole* theirs by challenge or no?

And what *they challenge, that they practiſe*: we doubt not but the *Remonſtrants* conſcience can tell him, there are many inſtances in England to be produced of men ordained in England without the hands of any Presbyter. The *Remonſtrant* is as *unhappy* as *peremptory* in his challenge he makes. *I challenge them to ſhew any one inſtance in the Church of England.*

Sir, the inſtances are without number. Some of us are ocular witneſſes of many ſcores at ſeverall ordinations ordained by a Biſhop in his private Chappell without the preſence of any Presbyter, but his owne domeſticke Chaplaine, and without any aſſiſtance from him ſave onely in reading prayers. But alaſſe what ſhould we fall to inſtances! Put caſe an Iriſh or Welſh Biſhop ordaines one at London in his chamber, or ſome Chappell, and admits him which commends

mends the perſon to him to joyne for faſhion ſake in the geſture of impoſition of hands, be hee of what place or Dioceſſe he will: how little doth this differ from ſole ordination, and how much from that *Regular and ordinate ordination* of former times? Sir, theſe are poore toyes to mocke the Church withall, if not God himſelfe too. Could ſuch a Biſhop ſay, as well as *Cyprian, Ego & Collegæ?* You tell us our Biſhops *may ſay no leſſe then Cyprian did.* But doth the ſtile of your *Letters of orders* ſpeake any ſuch thing? Let the Reader judge by a copy, *Tenore præſentium nos N. N. Providentiâ Divinâ Epiſc. notum facimus univerſis quod die menſis Anno in Capella. Nos præfatus Epiſcopus ſacros ordines dei præſidio celebrantes, dilectum nobis &c. E. B. de vitâ ſua laudabili, &c. a nobis examinat: & approbat. ad ſacro ſanct. Presbyt. ordinem ad miſimus rite & Canonicè ordinavimus & promovimus. In cujus rei teſtimonium ſigillum noſtrum Epiſcopale præſentibus apponi fecimus.* Conſtrue you this, *Ego & Collegæ*, brethren?

But you tell us, *Cyprians* phraſe, *Ego & Collegæ*, *was in the caſe of Aurelius made a Lector*, much to your advantage. If *a Reader* could not be ordained by a Biſhop alone, doe we thinke a Presbyter could? As for *Cyprians* 58. *Epiſt.* we produced it not as a proofe of ordination in the hands of Presbyters, much leſſe for the concurrent act of the people, as the Remonſtrant would intimate, but onely for the explication of the word *Collegæ*. But it ſeemes the Remonſtrant was reſolved to picke ſome quarrell, *and rather to play at ſmall game then ſtand out.* Page 70.

And if it *be the order of the Church of England as well as of the Councell of Carthage, that when a Presbyter is ordained* Page 71.

dained all the Presbyters that are preſent ſhall lay hands, &c. if there be ſuch an order, the more blameworthy *the Biſhops*, who being ſuch *ſevere cenſurers* of the breach of *Church* orders in others, are themſelves in the ſame crime, for though you ſet a ſtout face upon the buſineſſe, and tell us *that this order is perpetually and infallibly kept by you*; Yet the world knowes it is no ſuch matter unleſſe you meane that *all the Presbyters preſent doe infallibly and perpetually lay on hands in ordination*, becauſe *our ordinations* are ſo carried, that for the moſt part there is *but one*, ſometimes *not one* Presbyter there beſides the Biſhop.

Page 71. But why doe you take notice here of one Canon of the Councell of Carthage, and not of the other? *ut Epiſcopus ſine*, &c. that *a Biſhop ſhould ordaine none of the Clergie without the Counſell of his Clergie*, unleſſe it be, becauſe here is ſuch a manifeſt deflexion in the practiſe of ours from former times, as all the wit and Rhetoricke the Remonſtrant hath cannot cover.

Your next evaſion is a plaine leaving the queſtion; we are to prove that Biſhops in ancient times did not ordaine without Presbyters. You challenge us *to prove a Presbyters Regular ordaining without a Biſhop*; which is not the point in queſtion. Who doth here moſt *abuſe the Reader*, let himſelfe judge: but wee are accuſed not onely of *abuſing our Readers*, but our Authours too. And the Remonſtrant hopes he hath us here at ſuch a vantage, as ſhall try what modeſty is in us. *Three foule ſcapes are laid to our charge.* Firſt, *we abuſe Firmilianus, in caſting upon him an opinion of Presbyters ordaining, which he never held*; let us once againe view the place. *Firmilianus* ſpeaking of the true Church, ſaith,

ubi

ubi Præſident Majores natu, qui & Baptizandi & manum imponendi & ordinandi poſſident poteſtatem: the controverſie is, who theſe *Majores natu* be? *Biſhops ſaith he. Biſhops and Elders* ſay we. To prove it, we explicate *Firmilian* by *Firmilian*, calling a little before thoſe whom here he cals *Majores natu, Seniores & præpoſiti.* Which are not ſo farre from that clauſe but that they may be brought without *wire drawing or foyſting*; and are not ſo remote from that place, as thoſe words which himſelfe produceth, which we deſire the courteous Reader to conſider, becauſe we are charged by him, for *foyſting in and wyre drawing* the words of the Authour: and alſo becauſe the very words there cited by the Remonſtrant ſpeake of a power of *remitting ſinnes*, which we hope he will not ingroſſe to Biſhops, excluding Presbyters. *Pamelius* himſelfe is with us: who underſtands by *Seniores & prepoſiti*, the Presbyters and Biſhops. Page 72.

Our next ſcape, *is but groſſe ignorance*, in tranſlating *Ambroſes Presbyteri conſignant* by *Presbyters ordaining.* Every *Novice knowes conſigning ſignifies confirmation, and not ordaining.* Sir, we appeale from your Novices to judicious Readers, and intreat them to peruſe the text: and wee doubt not but upon due conſideration they will conclude forour ſence: let us then plead the caſe, and tell you firſt, That your *Deſiderius Heraldus* ſhewes both the word *ſignare* or *conſignare* in the phraſe of antiquity to be as much as *conſecrare*, and ſo doth *Cyprian* Epiſt. 2. and therefore it is not incapable of ſuch a ſence as we have put upon it. *In Arnob. li. 3.*

2. If the Reader pleaſe to view the place in *Ambroſe*, he ſhall finde that *Ambroſe* there is ſpeaking of ordaining

daining men to publique offices in the Church; and not of confirmation.

3. Though it should be taken for confirmation, yet you gaine nothing; for the same Canon, that put power of ordination into the hands of Bishops, places the power of confirmation also in their hands. And they among us that challenge the sole power of ordination, challenge also sole power of confirmation. If any man object that confirmation is not so appropriated to Bishops as ordination is, because (as some of you say) confirmation is onely reserved to them *honoris gratiâ*; ordination they have *necessitatis gratiâ*: this objection we have satisfied in our answer page 38. wherein we have shewed not onely from *Leo*, that the power of ordination was reserved to them onely *authoritate canonum*: but also that it was appropriated to them for their credit and authority. *Augustine* speakes almost in the same words: *Nam & in Alexandria, & per totum Ægyptum, si desit Episcopus, consecrat Presbyter*: that which in *Ambrose* is called *consignat*, is here called *consecrat*; and albeit the authors of both these bookes be questioned, yet both of them are acknowledged ancient, yea Doctor *Raynolds* affirmes the last of them from the 44. question was written above 300. yeeres after Christ: this is enough to us, that in antiquity *consignat* is expounded by *consecrat*; which cleares us of that imagined *guilt of a solœcisme*, that hee would fasten upon us: and this may satisfie (if this man be satisfiable) that bold challenge of the former page: *shew us but one instance of a Presbyters regular and practized ordaining without a Bishop, and carry the cause.*

Epist. Di. Right, part. 2. p. 91.

Quæst. de utroque mixtim. 101.

Our

Our third charge is double, *firſt of ſkill not too much:* Page 72.
ſecondly, of leſſe fidelity. Our want of skill is, in not diſtinguiſhing of *Chorepiſcopi* (whō we brought as inſtances of Presbyters ordaining without a Biſhop) *ſome of whom* (ſaith the Remonſtrant) *had the nature and power of Epiſcopacy to all purpoſes: and therefore might well, by the Biſhops licence in his owne charge impoſe hands.* Now, we may returne it to the Remonſtrant, that *he diſcovers not too much skill* in ſaying that *ſome Chorepiſcopi had both the nature and power of Epiſcopacy to all purpoſes*, and yet might not ordaine in *his own charge without the Biſhops licenſe*. For what needs a Biſhops licence to inable a *Chorepiſcopus* in his owne charge to doe that, for the doing of which hee *had before the nature and power of Epiſcopacy to all purpoſes.* This is juſt as our Biſhops are wont to do, who give a full power to a Presbyter at his ordination to preach the Goſpell, with a charge alſo to do it, and yet will not ſuffer him to preach, no not in his own Cure, without a licence. But how doth the Remonſtrant make good his diſtinction of his two ſorts of *Chorepiſcopi* from antiquity? Here we have *ipſe dixit* and no more. The peremptorineſſe of *Pythagoras* the maſter in affirming, & the ſilence of his ſchollars when he comes to prove. *Bellarmine* indeed tels us that ſome *Chorepiſcopi* were *ordained by more Biſhops then one*, and theſe had *power to ordaine*. Others were *ordained by one Biſhop*, and thoſe were *meere Presbyters and might not ordaine.* But with how much fidelity *Bellarmine*, and after him the Remonſtrant doth thus diſtinguiſh, let the Councell of *Antioch* determine: χωρεπίσκοπον δὲ χειροτονεῖν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως, ἣ ὑπὸ τῶν, ἐπισκόπου. Let the Chorepiſcopus be ordained by the Biſhop of the City, to whom hee *De Clericis, l. 1. c. 17.*

is subject. From which Councell wee gather that the Chorepiscopi were meere Presbyters, and that there were but one sort of them. First, because the Chorepiscopus was to be ordained by one Bishop, *ab Episcopo*, not *ab Episcopis*: whereas by the Canons a Bishop was to be ordained by many, or two at least. As for *Bellarmine*, his Chorepiscopus ordained by more Bishops then one; wee leave it to him to make good: indeed we finde in the same Canon, the Chorepiscopi in the plurall number had the imposition of the hands of Bishops, but when Chorepiscopus in the singular number is mentioned, then onely one Bishop is said to ordaine him.

2. Because the Chorepiscopus was to be subject to the Bishop of the City, *ab Episcopo civitatis cui subjicitur*: now we read no where of the subjection of one Bishop and his charge to another: *Cyprian* pleads the freedome of Bishops: telling us that each of them hath a portion of Christs flocke assigned to him, for which he is to give account to God.

3. Because he could not, nay he durst not exercise the power of Ordination without the leave of the Bishop: the Councell of Antioch sayes, *non audeat absque urbis Episcopo*: Conc. Ancyr. sayes, *non licere nisi cum literis ab Episcopo permissum fuerit*. None of this would have beene said, if he had beene a Bishop, as we have in part shewed in our answer, page 36.

We deny not, but that this power of ordaining was afterward taken away from the Chorepiscopi by the same authority of the Canons, and Ecclesiasticall rules, by which it was first appropriated to Bishops themselves, as *Leo. ep.* 88. witnesses, which to us is a 4th argument

ment to prove that they once had it, and that they had it as Presbyters: for if they had it as Biſhops, the taking of it away would have beene a degradation of them.

5. We might bring an argument *ad hominem*, to prove the Chorepiſcopi to be but Presbyters, becauſe they are ſayd *Conc. Næocæſar. Can.* 14. to be after the manner, or in imitation of the ſeventy: now according to the opinion of Hierarchicall men Biſhops ſucceed the Apoſtles, not the ſeventy.

To all that we have ſaid in this point, we might ad that not onely *Damaſus* in that Epiſtle which goes under his name, *ep.* 4. but alſo *Leo ep.* 88. proves them to be but meere Presbyters, to whoſe ſentence *conc.* 2. *Hiſpal. can.* 7. ſubſcribes.

Now leaving the *Chorepiſcopi* we will give the reader a hint to prove, that not onely the Presbyters of *Alexandria*, and the Chorepiſcopi, but further, the Presbyters of the City with the Biſhops leave might ordaine, which we prove from *conc. Ancyr. can.* 13. named before: where it is ſaid, *It is not lawfull for Chorepiſcopi to ordaine Presbyters or Deacons: nor for the Presbyters of the City without the Biſhop his letters in an other pariſh:* from which it appeares, that Presbyters of the City had the ſame power to ordaine which the rurall Biſhops had. Becauſe the reſtraint is layed equally upon both: this is not onely our conſtruction of the Canon, Biſhop *Bilſon*, Doctor *Downam. def. lib.* 1. *cap.* 8. ſay the ſame, and Doctor *Downam* gathers from thence, that Presbyters in the City might doe more then rurall Presbyters. So doth *Spalatenſis*, who endeavouring to elude the text hath no other way but by foiſting in a paſſage, which is not in the Greeke text. And by this

Perpet. gou. c. 14.

L. 2. *c.* 3. *n.* 52. 53.

time we hope we have cleared our fidelity in quoting of the Councels of Antioch and Ancyra: both which the Remonstrant thought his bare word enough to blast. Now we appeale to equall judgements whether *the labour of this section were meerely cast away or no.* The Remonstrant *grants sole ordination was in regard of the exercise not challenged by Bishops in the Primitive times,* Though he would perswade the reader *we cannot but confesse it out of Hierome and Chrysostome.* Yet let the reader consult the 37. page of our answer which the Remonstrant leaves unanswered, and judge betweene us, how farre we are from such confession: his *onely shift now is to say our Bishops neither challenge nor exercise any such power.* We have evidently proved they doe both, *manet ergo inconcussum*, our Bishops and the Bishops of former times are two.

SECT. IX.

Page 73. HEre saith the Remonstrant, *we beat the aire.* And yet not the aire, but the Remonstrant too into the confession of that which would not be confest heretofore by such of thē especially as have contended for such *a Bishop as exercised spirituall jurisdiction out of his owne peculiarly demandated authority. If jurisdiction exercised from an authority peculiarly demandated, how not solely?* Well, now it is granted that this *sole is cryed downe by store of antiquity.* So then here we doe *not falsifie*, and it is granted *that Presbyters have and ought to have and exercise a jurisdiction within their owne charge.* But here the Remonstrant will distinguish againe, it

Epis. Dr. Right, part. 2. p. 10.

Page 74.

is

is in *foro conscientiæ.* But consider Reader, whether this be the jurisdiction here under dispute. Whether *that store of antiquity* which he confesseth to *cry downe sole jurisdiction*, speake of a jurisdiction *in foro conscientiæ*, as his false Margent saith, *Clem Alexan.* (whom we cited) *doth.* But indeed this distinction of the Remonstrant of a jurisdiction in *foro interno* and *in foro externo*, is like that distinction of *Reflexivè* and *Archipodialiter.* For all humane jurisdiction is *in foro externo.* If preaching the word (which is especially aim'd at by the Remonstrant, be an exercise of jurisdiction, Then he that hath the Bishops licence to preach in the Dioceſſe, hath power to exercise jurisdiction through the Dioceſſe, and an University preacher throughout the whole Kingdome. Away with these toyes. He grants againe, *that Presbyters ought to be consulted with in the great affaires of the Church, but doe* our quotations prove no more? *Bishops had their Ecclesiasticall Councell of Presbyters, with whom they did consult in the greatest matters:* and was it onely in the *greatest* matters? Is this all that *Cyprian* saith? All that the Councell of *Carthage* saith when it determines *ut Episcopus nullius causam audiat absque præsentia Clericorum; alioquin irrita erit sententia Episcopi, nisi Clericorum præsentia confirmetur.* Doth this speak onely of great matters; when it saith *Nullius causam audiat?* Is this onely of a jurisdiction the Presbyters had *in foro conscientiæ?* Were Bishops with their *Consistory* wont *to sit to heare and judge causes in foro conscientiæ?* good Reader judge of this mans truth and ingenuity, who not being able to divert the stroke of that Antiquity we brought to manifest a difference betweene ours and the former Bishops in the exercise

In our former booke sententia was by a mistake printed for presentia, the whole Canon not being quoted.

of their jurisdiction, would cast a mist before his Readers eyes, and perswade him he grants the whole section, when indeed hee grants nothing, onely seekes to slide away in the darke.

But our Bishops have their Deanes and Chapters (say you) *and the lawes of our Church frequently make that use of them.* Yes you have Deanes and Chapters, but who knowes not that they have a jurisdiction distinct from the Bishops, in which the Bishop hath nothing to doe with theirs, nor they with his. And *the Bishops also derive the exercise of jurisdiction to others* (we know it too well) to Chancellours, Commissaries, Officials, and other of their underlings, even to the commanding of Christs Ministers to denounce their censures without any discerning what equity is in the cause. And what advise or assistance of Ministers is required, appeares by the very stile of your excommunications. *G. R. Doctor of Law, Commissary, &c. to all Rectors, &c. For as much as we proceeding rightly, &c. have adjudged all and every one whose names are under-written to be excommunicated. We doe therefore commit to you, &c. to denounce openly under paine and perill, &c. Given under our Seale such a day, &c.* Let any footsteps of such a power be shewed in antiquity.

Presbyters he grants *had their votes in Provinciall synods: we from good authority* say more, they had their votes in all ordinary Iudicatures.

Page 74. But after all these grants, which are as good as nothing; now he comes to plead his owne. *We justly say that the superiority of jurisdiction is so in the Bishop, as that Presbyters neither may, nor did exercise it without him?* to what purpose is this? if the Remonstrant speake

ſpeake of *Scripture times:* We have proved there *was no ſuperiority* in them: if of *latter times*, it is not to the queſtion: wee are proving Biſhops never exerciſed juriſdiction without their Presbyters, as ours doe. He puts us to prove Presbyters exerciſed juriſdiction without Biſhops, *quam iniquè?*

But the exerciſe of externall juriſdiction is derived from, by, and under the Biſhop: No, neither from, by, nor under the Biſhop, but from God, who hath made them overſeers and rulers, and by the ſame Eccleſiaſticall authority that hath made you Biſhops: and *under* Biſhops not in reſpect of divine *power*, but (if at all) in reſpect of Eccleſiaſticall *Canons* onely. Your *Timothy* and *Titus* we ſhall meet in due place. Your *Ignatius and the reſt of your teſtimonies you could produce* would (as you ſay truely) but ſurfeit the readers eyes, unleſſe you could bring them to prove, *that Biſhops did and might exerciſe ſole juriſdiction.* Onely becauſe you ſo *triumph in our ſuppoſed ſcapes*; let us intreat you, or the reader for you to looke upon your cited Councell of Antioch 24,25, Canon; where you ſay the Biſhop hath power *of thoſe things that belong to the Church*, and ſee whether that ſpeakes one word of juriſdiction: or be not wholy to be underſtood, of the diſtribution of the goods of the Church, as both the inſtance given in the Canon, and *Zonaras* on that place manifeſt. Page 75. Page 75.

One ſhift yet the Remonſtrant hath more: and that is to tell us, that *this joynt government was but occaſionall and temporary in times of perſecution.* But when a *generall peace had bleſſed them, and they had a concurrence of ſoveraigne and ſubordinate authority with them, they began ſo much to remit this care of conjoyning their forces, as* Page 76.

they

they supposed to finde lesse need of it. Doctor *Downham* to whom hee referres in the page before, assignes other reasons. Namely Presbyters *desiring their ease and Scholasticall quietnesse* (which he saith and proves not) and also the *Bishops desiring to rule alone*: which we finde to be the true cause by experience. For if the Bishops be of the Remonstrants mind, *perswaded that the more frequent communicating of all the important businesse of the Church, whether censures or determinations with those grave assistants, which in the eye of the Law are designed to this purpose, were a thing not onely unprejudiciall to the honour of Episcopacy, but behovefull to the Church.* Why should not the Bishops doe it? save onely, that their ambitious desires of ruling alone swayes them against their owne judgement, and the determinations of the law. But indeed if this communicating of all the important businesse of the Church with those grave assistants you speake of or with the Presbyters of the whole Dioceese, if you will, be onely an assuming them into the fellowship of consulting and deliberating without any decisive suffrage, leaving the Bishop to follow or not to follow their advise; this is but a meere cosenage of the reader, and doth not hinder the sole power of Episcopall jurisdiction. And this is all that *Downam* grants *lib.* 1. *c.*7. *p.*161. where he saith that Bishops doe assume Presbyters for advise and direction, as a Prince doth his Counsellors, not as a Consull doth his Senators who are cojudges with the Consul. And this we perceive the Remonstrant well likes of, as that which makes much for the honour of their function.

Down. Defen. 1. *lib.c.*8.

Page 76. And now sir, you see *that we have not fished all night, and*

and caught nothing: wee have caught your *ſole juriſdiction*: and might have caught your ſelfe, were you not ſuch a *Proteus*, ſuch a *Polypus* to ſhift your ſelfe into all formes and Colours. Having proved that Biſhops in all times, ſucceeding the Apoſtles, had Presbyters joyned with them in the exerciſe of their juriſdiction; and that our Biſhops have none, is more evident then that it needs proofe. This is more to you then *Baculus in Angulo*: it cannot but be *Spina in oculis, & Sagitta in viſceribus, a thorne in your eye*, and an *arrow in your heart*, convincing you to your griefe, that *the Biſhops you plead for, and the Biſhops of former times are two.*

SECT. X.

OUr next Section the Remonſtrant ſaith, *runs yet wilder*; it is then becauſe we proſecute a practice of the Biſhops *more extravagant* then the former: And that is the delegation of the power of their juriſdictiō to others; wch the Remonſtrant would firſt excuſe, as *an accidentall errour of ſome particular man, not to be faſtned upon all.* But we deſire to know the *man*, the *Biſhop* in all England who hath not given power to *Chancellors, Commiſſaries, Officials* to ſuſpend, excommunicate, abſolve, execute all cenſures, *but one*: and doth the Remonſtrant thinke now to ſtoppe our mouthes with ſaying, *it is a particular error of ſome men?* whereas it is evident enough that our Engliſh Epiſcopacy cannot poſſibly be exerciſed without delegating of their power to a multitude of inferiour inſtruments. Can one Biſhop having 500. or a 1000. Pariſhes under him, Page 77.

diſcharge all buſineſſes belonging to teſtamentary and decimall cauſes and ſuites, to preach the Word, and adminiſter the Sacraments, &c. to take a due overſight alſo of all Miniſters and people without the helpe of others. Nor will that other excuſe doe it, *That it is but an accidentall error, and though granted, concludes not, that our Biſhops challenge to themſelves any other ſpirituall power, then was delegated to Timothy and Titus.* Sir we abhorre it, as an unworthy thing, to *compare our Biſhops* with *Timothy or Titus*; the compariſon is betweene our Biſhops and Biſhops of former times.

Page 77.

But to pleaſe you this once, we will admit the compariſon and ſhew howeven in this particular that you count ſo *monſtrous*, our Biſhops challenge a power *never delegated to Timothy nor Titus.* And we prove it thus:

Page 78.

Timothy and Titus never had a power delegated to them to devolve that power of governing the Church, which God had intruſted into their hands upon perſons incapable of it by Gods ordinance. But our Biſhops doe ſo. *Ergo.*

The Remonſtrant thinkes by impleading other reformed Churches, as guilty of the ſame crime; to force us either to condemne them, or to acquit him. But the reformed Churches, if they doe practiſe any ſuch thing, are of age to anſwer for themſelves. Our buſineſſe is with the Remonſtrant and the perſons and practices which he hath taken the tuition of. Whom we *charging as in a generality with wholy intruſting the power of ſpirituall juriſdiction to their Chancellors, and their Commiſſaries*: their good friend tels us *we foulely overreach.* The *aſſiſtance* of theſe creatures *they uſe indeed,*

Page 78.

deed, but they neither *negligently* or *wilfully deveſt themſelves of that, and wholy put it into Laicke hands. This is a meere ſlander*: that Biſhops deveſt themſelves of their *power* we never ſaid. That they doe either *negligently* or *wilfully* decline *that office* which they call theirs, we need not ſay, it is ſo apparent. And as apparent it is, that they *doe intruſt the power of juriſdiction wholly into Laicke hands*: for their Chancellors, and Commiſſaries having power of *juriſdiction* by *patent ſetled* upon them, and exerciſing that *juriſdiction* in all the parts of it, conventing, admoniſhing, ſuſpending, excommunicating, abſolving without the preſence or aſſiſtance of a *Biſhop* or recourſe to him: we thinke impartiall Judges will ſay wee are neither *ſlanderers nor over-reachers*.

In our former anſwer we fully cleared from *Cyprian*, how farre hee was from delegating his power to a Chancellour, &c. This he ſleights as a *negative authority*, yet it is ſufficient to condemne a practice that never had being in the thoughts of primitive times. And we beleeve it ſatisfies all others, becauſe the Remonſtrant ſaith *it is very like it was ſo*: Though according to his old way of diverſion he tels us, as *Cyprian did not referre to a Chancellor, ſo neither to the bench of a* Laicke *Presbytery*: yet he that is but meanly verſed in *Cyprian*, may eaſily ſee that it is no unuſuall thing in that holy martyr, to referre the determinations of cauſes *ad Clerum & Plebem*. Page 79. Page 79.

But the Remonſtrant thinkes to patronize the practice of our preſent Biſhops by *Silvanus* the good Biſhop of Troas. And what did *Silvanus* to the countenancing of this practice? *perceiving that ſome of his*

Clergie did corruptly make gaine of causes (civill causes, causes of difference betweene party and party, or as you phrase it, page 91. *unkind quarrels of dissenting neighbours*) he would no more appoint any of his *Clergy* to be Judge, but made *choice of some faithfull man of the Laity*. Now this is as much to the purpose (good sir) as *Posthumus* his pleading in *Martiall*. We are confuting the practice of our Bishops in making over their spirituall jurisdiction to Laymen, and he brings in a story of a *good Bishop*, that having *a bad Clergy*, intrusted honest men with civill judicature rather then them.

Lis est vobis de tribus capellis: Tu Cannas, Mithridaticumque bellum, Magna voce tonas Iam dic Posthume, de tribus capellis. Mart. l. 6 Page 80. Balsum. in Can. 78 Concil. Carthag. in can. 100. Zonar. in can. Concil. Carth. 81. & can. 108.

As full to the purpose is *that of Ecclesiæ ecdici, or Episcoporum Ecdici*, to prove the *Antiquity of Chancellors and Commissaries*. For their *Ecdici* were *men* appointed to be the *advocates* of the *Church*, to plead the Churches cause before the *Emperours* against the *tyranny* of their potent adversaries. But we never read that the *Bishops* did put over the *government* of the *Church* to them: we could with all our hearts give this honour to *Civilians* to be the Churches *advocates*, but not the Churches Judges, which the Bishops give them leave to be: to defend the Church against the tyranny of others, but not to tyrannize over the Church: Doctor *Downeham* was more ingenuous in this, then this Remonstrant; who grants that till *about* 400 *yeeres after Christ, Bishops had no ordinary Vicars that were not Clergy men*; No, say we, nor Clergy men neither: the office was not knowne in those times: neither can they produce any instance of any, either of Laity or Clergy that ever those times saw in that office. This saith the Remonstrant, *is a poore brave*. But till he can produce such instances, our challenge will stand strong enough

Page 79.

not-

notwithſtanding his great words. But his put off is poorer; to fly from officers intruſted with ſpirituall jurisdiction unto ſuch inferiour inſtruments, (*Secretaries and Atturneys*) as are of neceſſary ſervice in all Courts of judicature, whether Civill or Eccleſiaſticall. Page 73.

To make all ſure, the Remonſtrant referres his Reader to Sir *Thomas Ridley* (whoſe Treatiſe he ſtumbled upon in an ill houre for the maine of his cauſe: for he tels us page 116. *that Chancellors are equall, or neere equall in time to Biſhops; as both the Law it ſelfe and ſtories ſhew.* So that while the Remonſtrant is over ſtudious to prove the *Antiquity of Chancellors*, he overthrowes the *Antiquity of Biſhops: incidit in Scyllam, &c.* As for that he ſpake of the *Eccleſiæ Ecdici*, *that they were the ſame in former times that our Chancellors are now*: If there be more credit to be given to his *Papias and Gothofred*, then to the originall Canons themſelves (where they are called not τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἔκδικοι, but τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἔκδικοι) we yeeld the cauſe.

SECT. XI.

HAving entered upon the differences betweene ours and former Biſhops in point of juriſdiction: we deſcended into a diſcovery of this in three particulars. Firſt, in the *ſole juriſdiction* ours aſſume. Secondly, *In that delegation they make of this power.* Thirdly, in their execution of *that juriſdiction*: and here wee fall upon that *unchriſtian and unnaturall proceeding of theirs, by oathes Ex officio*; which the Remonſtrant is very

angry at, and that hee may ſtill approve himſelfe the *Euδυ.* or advocate of the worſt cauſes, engages all his ſtrength and wit for the *maintaining* of that, which hath beene the ruine of ſo many perſons, the racke of ſo many conſciences, the worſt part of the Spaniſh Inquiſition

——*quo ſiculi non invenere Tyranni*
Tormentum majus.

To defend this, he cares not how he abuſeth *us*, Mr. *Calume*, *the Lawyes*, *the Scriptures*; So that he may but uphold this *oath*, that is now ſinking under the weight of its owne guilt.

Page 81. Firſt, *he abuſes Scriptures* in producing, *Exod.* 22.10, 11. *Num.* 5.19. as preſidents for the oath. Truly ſir, the onely text that would beſt have fitted your purpoſe, is that of *Caiphas* the *High Prieſt adjudging our Lord in the name of the living God.* Which how tyrannous an adjuration it was will eaſily appeare to any that conſults interpreters upon that place. Your alledged texts helpe you not a whit; that of *Exod.* 22.10,11. ſpeakes to this purpoſe: A man commits goods to his neighbour, they miſcarry under his hand; it is knowne he had them, how they miſcarried it is not knowne; in this caſe the man is to cleare his innocencie upon his oath: what is this to the compelling of a man in caſes criminall to betray himſelfe by an oath? The other text *Numb.* 5.19. availes you leſſe, for if ſuch an oath were now lawfull, then *oathes Ex officio* might be miniſtred in cauſes of death. It is knowne, Adultery was death by *Moſes* his law; and it is as well knowne that this Law of the water of jelouſie was not morall, but judiciall, peculiar to the policie of the Jewes,

Matth. 26.63.

Your Biſhop of the Church of *Thyatira*, might have given his wife *Iezabel* (as you call her) this oath.

Jewes, and that upon particular cauſes, to wit, the invate jealouſie of that Nation which could no otherwiſe be appeaſed. As for your inſtance out of Maſter *Calvins* Epiſtle, wherein you would make your reader beleeve that the Conſiſtory of *Geneva* did give ſuch an oath to *Camperell* whereby he and the reſt ſhould be tied *to diſcover their purpoſes and intentions*; No ſuch thing appeares in the Epiſtle. We finde indeed that two of that company having confeſſed the wickedneſſe wherewith they were charged, and the reſt impudently denying it, *Calvin* thought it fit to make them confeſſe the truth upon oath. *Corneus*, who had confeſſed all before, preſſing them not to forſweare themſelves, prevailed ſo, as that they confeſſed all; and the dancing alſo above what was charged upon them. All that we can collect is, that an oath was thought meet to be given, to make them confeſſe to Gods glory, what was proved by two witneſſes, but that they were bound to confeſſe their intentions here is no ſyllable of it in the epiſtle. And therefore to what purpoſe you bring in this to warrant your oath *Ex officio*, unleſſe it be for want of better inſtances, we know not. *Calv. ad Farel.*

The Acts of *Diocleſian Maxim.* (Let them be blamed that called him *Maximilian*: poore men cannot have their Preſſe wayted on, as your greatneſſe may:) You doe as good as paſſe by, ſo doe you the practice of the ancient times, and which is a greater Jeofailer then our *Maximillian*; and think it is enough to tell us, *this hinders not but in caſe of a juſtly grounded ſuſpition and complaint of a halfe approved offence, a man ſhould manifeſt his innocency by oath.* Whenas we produced theſe teſtimonies Page 83. Page 84.

teſtimonies to ſhew that of old no party was put to his oath upon halfe proofe, nor proceeded againſt, but upon apparent teſtimonies of more witneſſes then one, which might be conceived to be impartiall.

Whereby it is manifeſt that the proceedings in judicature, for which you contend *herein*, differ from them of old. So hot is the man in the quarrell of his oath, that he ſtrikes his own friends, to reach a blow at us; charging his *good friend Gregory* with a *plain contradiction* (for the words are his not ours) in which *he ſaith we contradict our ſelves*. Page 74. This is the *poore all* hee hath ſaid in defence of the oath *Ex Officio*; and could he have ſaid *more, it is like we ſhould have heard it*. If the reader deſire to ſee further how abominable this oath is, how cryed downe by learned men, how contrary to the Word of God, the law of nature, to the civill and and Canon lawes, and to the ſtatutes of our kingdome, he may finde it in that *proud braying ſchiſmatick* Maſter *Parker*; * for ſo he is called in print. For our parts, we ſhall need to ſay no more about this oath, God in mercy to his afflicted having put into the hearts of our Worthies to condemne it to hell from whence it came.

By Biſhop *Hall*, In his Epiſcopacy by divine right.

* *Parker* on the coffe, part. 2. c. 8. ſect. 2.

SECT. XII.

OUr next Section the Remonſtrant tels us, *he is reſolved to neglect*: we ſhould have as ſoone beleeved him, if he had ſaid ſo of all the reſt: we beleeve this *neglect* ſprings neither from a deſire to *eaſe* us, *nor to anger us*; but becauſe he knowes not what to ſay againſt

gainſt it. If he did intend *to anger us* he is much miſtaken, for it pleaſeth us well to heare him give ſo full a teſtimony, that ſecular *imployments are unſuitable to the Miniſters of the Goſpell. Unleſſe in thoſe two excepted caſes of the extraordinary occaſions and ſervices of a Prince or State.* And the compoſing of unkind *quarrels of diſſenting neighbours.* We take what he grants us here ſo kindly, that we pardon his unfit compariſon *betweene S. Pauls Tent-making to ſupply his owne neceſſities*, that he might not be burthenſome to the Church, & *the State imployment of our Biſhops.* And ſhould in this Section fully have joyned hands with him, but that we muſt needs tell him at the parting, *that had our Biſhops never ingaged themſelves in ſecular affaires*; but *ex officio generali Charitatis* and had beene ſo free from ambition as he would make the world beleeve they are (neither ſhould wee have beene ſo large in this Section, nor ſo aboundant in our proceſſe, nor would the Parliament have made that proviſion againſt the ſecular imployment of Clergy men as they have lately done. Page 90,91.

SECT. XIII.

THe beſt Charter pleaded for Epiſcopacy in former times was Eccleſiaſticall conſtitution, and the favour of Princes. But our latter Biſhops ſuſpecting this would prove too weake and ſandie a foundation to ſupport a building of that tranſcending loftineſſe, that they have ſtudied to advance the Babell of Epiſcopacy unto, have indeavoured to under-pinne

it with some texts of Scripture, that they might plead a *Jus divinum* for it: that the consciences of all might be tyed up from attempting to pull down their proud Fabricke; but none of them is more confident in this plea then this Remonstrant, who is content that Bishops should for ever be hooted out of the Church, and be disclaimed as usurpers, if they claime any other power then what the Scripture gives them, especially bearing his cause upon *Timothy, and Titus, and the Angels of the 7. Churches.*

Now because one grain of Scripture is of more efficacy & esteeme to faith, then whole volumes of humane testimonies; we indeavoured to shew the impertineney of his allegations especially in those two instances.

And concerning *Timothy and Titus*, we undertooke two things: First, that they were not Bishops (in his sence) but Evangelists, the companions of the Apostles in founding of Churches, or sent by them from place to place, but never setled in any fixed pastorall charge, and this wee shewed out of the story of the Acts, and the Epistles. The other was, that granting *ex abundanti* they had beene Bishops, yet they never exercised any such jurisdiction as ours doe.

But because the great hinge of the controversie depends upon the instances of *Timothy and Titus*, before we come to answer our Remonstrant, we will promise these few propositions granted by most of the patrons of Episcopacy.

First, *Evangelists* properly so called, were men extraordinarily imployed in preaching the Gospell without a setled residence upon any one charge. They were *Comites, & Vicarii Apostolorum, Vice-Apostles*, who had

Def. p. 94.

had *Curam Vicariam omnium Eccleſiarum*, as the *Apoſtles* had *Curam principalem*. And did (as *Ambroſe* ſpeakes) *Evangelizare ſine Cathedra.*

Secondly, It is granted by our Remonſtrant, and his appendant *Scultetus*, and many others. That *Timothy* was properly an *Evangeliſt*, while he travelled up and downe with the Apoſtles. Page 100.

Thirdly, It is expreſſely granted, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were no Biſhops till after *Pauls* firſt being at *Rome*. That is, after the end of the Hiſtories of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*. Page 97.

Fourthly, The firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, and the Epiſtle to *Titus*, from whence all their grounds for Epiſcopacy are fetcht, were written by *Paul* before his firſt going to *Rome*. And this is acknowledged by all interpreters and Chronologers, that we have conſulted with upon this point, *Baronius* himſelfe affirming it. And the Remonſtrants owne grounds will force him to acknowledge that the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy* was alſo written at *Pauls* firſt being at *Rome*. For that ſecond Epiſtle orders him to bring *Marke* alone with him, who by the Remonſtrants account died five or ſix yeeres before *Paul*. Which could not have beene, if this Epiſtle were written at *Pauls* ſecond comming to Rome. *Eſtius* alſo following *Baronius* gives good reaſon that the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy* was written at *Pauls* firſt being at *Rome*. *Vide Lud. Capell. hiſt. Eccleſ. p. 66. 74.* Page 60. *Eſtius in Arg. in ſecundam ep ad Tim.*

Fiftly, If *Timothy* and *Titus* were not Biſhops when theſe Epiſtles were written unto them, then the maine grounds of *Epiſcopacy by divine right* ſinke by their owne confeſſion. Biſhop *Hall*, in his *Epiſcopacy by divine right*, part 2. ſect. 4. concludes thus peremptorily, *That*

So Bilſon. *that if the eſpeciall power of ordination and power of ruling and cenſuring Presbyters be not cleare in the Apoſtles charge to theſe two Biſhops, the one of Creete, the other of Epheſus, I ſhall yeeld the cauſe, and confeſſe to want my ſences.* And it muſt needs be ſo; for if *Timothy* were not then a Biſhop, the Biſhops power of charging Presbyters, of proving and examining Deacons, of rebuking Elders, and ruling over them, and his impoſition of hands to ordaine Presbyters, &c. doe all faile. And Biſhops in theſe can plead no ſucceſſion to *Timothy and Titus* by theſe Scriptures more then other Presbyters may. For if they were not Biſhops, then all theſe were done by them as extraordinary Officers, to which there were no ſucceſſors.

Vide Epiſc. by Di. Right, p. 2. Sixtly, By the confeſſion of the patrons of Epiſcopacy. It is not onely incongruous, but ſacrilegious for a Miniſter to deſcend from a ſuperiour order to an inferiour, according to the great Counſell of Chalcedon.

Seventhly, In all that ſpace of time from the end of the Acts of the Apoſtles untill the middle of *Trajans* raigne there is nothing certaine to be drawne out of Eccleſiaſtieall Authours about the affaires of the Church, thus writeth *Joſephus Scaliger*. Thus *Tilenus* *Prolegom. in Chron. Euſeb.* when he was moſt Epiſcopall, and *Euſebius* long before them both ſaith, It cannot be eaſily ſhewed who were the true followers of the Apoſtles, no further then it can be gathered out of the Epiſtles of *Paul*.

Euſeb. lib. 3. c. 4. If the intelligent Reader weigh and conſider theſe granted propoſitions, he may with eaſe ſee how the life-blood of Epiſcopacy from *Timothy* and *Titus* is drayn'd out: for if they were not Biſhops till after

Pauls

Pauls first being at *Rome*, then not when the Epistles were written to them according to the fourth proposition, and then their cause failes: if any shall say they were Bishops before *Pauls* first being at *Rome*, contrary to the third proposition, then they make them Bishops, while by the story its apparent they were Evangelists, and did *Evangelizare sine cathedra*, and so clash against the second.

In a word, the office of an Evangelist being a higher degree of Ministery then that of Bishops, make them Bishops when you please, you degrade them contrary to our sixt proposition: whiles the Remonstrant tryes to reconcile these things, we shall make further use of them in our scanning his allegations in this section, to which we now proceed. Ephes. 4. 11.

Where first the Reader may please to observe that the Remonstrant slideth by our marginall wherein we shewed the delineation that *Eusebius* makes of an Evangelist, and desired the Reader to judge thereby whether *Timothy* and *Titus* were not Evangelists. Onely he chargeth us with boldnesse for calling them so, though himselfe afterward confesseth it, page 98: p. 100. But why must this be boldnesse? Forsooth, because though *Timothy* be expressely called an Evangelist, yet *there is no text, no not the least intimation, no not so much as the least ground of a conjecture, that Titus was an Evangelist.* And if so, why doe you afterwards grant it? But whether you doe or no, that it was so we have proved sufficiently in our answer. But let any indifferent man here consider the iniquity of the Remonstrant that challengeth us for calling *Titus* an Evangelist without a text for his name; and yet thinks Page 92.

himselfe much wronged if wee grant him not, that *Timothy and Titus* and the Angels of the Church were Bishops, though he hath no text for the name, nor for the office? Secondly, To our text, 2. *Tim.* 4. 5. πόνησον ἔργον εὐαγγελιστοῦ, *doe the worke of an Evangelist*, saith he, Page 93. *rather intimates he was no Evangelist, then that he was:* as if it were no more, then for the Remonstrant *to desire his friend to doe the worke of a Secretary or Sollicitor for him, this implies he is neither.* A very cleare glosse. *Paul* doth not here intreat, as we conceive, but charge. He speakes *Imperative*, not *Impetrative*. Compare this, not with the phrases of the Remonstrant, but with the phrases of the same Apostle: and then judge. In the same Epistle 2 Chapt. 3. The same Apostle saith to the same person, *endure hardnesse as a good souldier of Christ*: doth that imply *Timothy* was no souldier of Christ, but onely so imployed for the time? So againe, in the 15. verse of the same Chapter, when the Apostle saith, *study to approve thy selfe a workman that needs not to be ashamed:* doth this prove that *Timothy* was not a workeman but onely for the time? When *Paul* saith, 1 *Cor.* 16. 13. *quite your selves like men*, doth that shew they were not men? but onely so imployed for the time. How would the Remonstrant have triumphed over such a high peece of ridiculous learning in our answer? had we turned off all these texts which use to be produced as proofes of Episcopall authority in *Timothy and Titus* with such a shift as this? this doth not shew it was their worke, but onely they were so imployed for the time.

Wee adde further, That when you acknowledge *Timothy* was to doe the office of an Evangelist (for

(for ſo your compariſon of *your friends doings the office of a Secretary* warrants us to interpret you) you muſt neceſſarily meane the extraordinary Evangeliſt (for you ſcoffe page 94. at an ordinary Evangeliſt, as a *new fiction*) which if ſo, then conſider how abſurd a thing it is to bid the inferior doe the worke of a ſuperior. Superiours may be intreated to doe the worke of inferiours, becauſe they come within the ſpheare of their activity, and comprehend either virtually or formally what the inferiours are to doe. As Apoſtles have power to doe all that Evangeliſts, Presbyters and Deacons can doe; and Evangeliſts all that Presbyters, &c. but not *è converſo*. Would it not be abſurd to bid a Curate doe the office of a Biſhop? Or a Presbyter the office of an Apoſtle? From all this we conclude, That when *Paul* bids *Timothy, Doe the worke of an Evangeliſt:* he bids him goe on with ſpeed to execute his Vice-Apoſtolicall office in watering the ſeverall Churches in *Aſia, &c.*

But ſaith he, if he were an Evangeliſt, he may be that, and a Biſhop too. For *wee doe but dreame when we diſtinguiſh of Evangeliſts.* Truely ſir, this dreame was the fruit of our reading, the fancy of the Authour of Epiſcopacies divine right, and there we finde our ordinary guifted Evangeliſt, under which name indeed we compriſe all preachers.

Part 2. p. 2. An Evangeliſt in the naturall ſence of the words is he that preacheth the glad tidings of the Goſpell.

The other branch of that diſtinction; Evangeliſts of extraordinary guifts and employments we finde in Scripture: and in this defence too, *Truth is, their ordinary Evangeliſts are a new fiction.* True, if we ſpeake of the office of the *Evangeliſts*, but to give the title of *Evangeliſt*, according to the naturall ſignification of the

Page 94.

the word to ordinary preachers of the Goſpell, is neither *new* nor *fiction*.

Well, *our argument we raiſe upon this ground is ſlight. Paul beſought Timothy to abide ſtill at Epheſus*, 1. *Tim.* 1. 3. Page 95. *which had beene a needleſſe importunity, if he had had the Epiſcopal charge of Epheſus, for then neceſſarily he muſt have reſided there.* But what's his anſwer to this argument? Nothing, onely ſaith it is *ſlight*.

And that other argument brought from *Timothies* perpetuall moving from place to place, to prove that he was never fixed in an Epiſcopall ſtation, is of as *little force* with him. *The neceſſities of thoſe times were ſuch, as made even the moſt fixed Starres planetary, calling them frequently, from the places of their abode to thoſe Services that were of moſt uſe for the ſucceſſe of that great worke: yet ſo that after their errands fully done they returned to their owne charge.* Let us once profeſſe as much confidence in our cauſe as the Remonſtrant doth in his: We challenge him to ſhew in all the new Teſtament, any one that was appointed overſeer of a particular Church, whoſe motion was as *planetary* as wee have ſhewed that of *Timothy* and *Titus* to have beene. Or if that faile, let him but ſhew that after *Timothy* or *Titus* went abroad upon the Service of the Churches, they did conſtantly or ordinarily returne either to *Epheſus* or *Creet*, and not to the places either of the Apoſtles preſent abode or appointment. And let them take *Timothy* and *Titus* as theirs, the patrons and preſidents of Epiſcopacy. But till they can ſhew this, we muſt beleeve and affirme *Timothy* and *Titus* are Evangeliſts and no Biſhops.

Our next argument, from *Act.* 20. *is but a Reed.*

Happy

Happy Remonſtrant that deales with ſuch impotent adverſaries; our firſt argument is ſlight, our ſecond is of no force, our third is but a reed. Yet let us tell you, *Hæret Lateri Lethalis Arundo*. We affirmed, & upon certaine grounds, *Acts* 20.4: (though the Remonſtrant know it not) that *Timothy* was with *Paul* at the meeting at *Miletum*, and from thence argued that had *Timothy* been B. of *Epheſus*, *Paul* would have given him a charge of feeding the flocke, and not the Elders, but would have given them direction for their carriage, at leaſt, would not ſo have forgot himſelfe as to call the Elders Biſhops, before their Biſhops face. You cannot ſhake it out ſo eaſily.

In all which the Remonſtrant ſaith, *we goe upon a wrong ground*: But ſure ſir, you are not ſo ignorant of our meaning, as by your queſtions you would ſeeme to be. We grant that theſe aſſembled perſons, were Presbyters or Biſhops in a parity, but neither in imparity, neither under *Timothy* nor any other Biſhop. And to this purpoſe is our argument, from the want of directions to them as inferiour: yet notwithſtanding the Remonſtrant would be glad to picke what holes he can in our argument; yet in part he grants what we conclude: *That they were all Biſhops*, onely with this addition, *they were not meere Presbyters*: but upon what ground? The word it ſelfe imports they were Biſhops *omnium*. And doth not the other word πρεσβυτερους import as ſtrongly they were Presbyters? And the truth is they were Presbyters, whom the holy Ghoſt had made Biſhops. Foreſeeing now his owne words would ſnarle him, if he ſhould grant them all Biſhops, he muſt grant there were more Biſhops then one in *Epheſus*, he puts by that blow, telling us that *though they* Page 96.

were sent for from Ephesus, yet they were not said to be all of Ephesus. Thither they were called from divers parts, which seems to be implyed in these words, ye all amongst whom, &c. This is but a poore evasion: For first, the holy Ghost tels us, that *Paul* did now study expedition, and did decline *Ephesus* of purpose because he would not spend time in *Asia*: Now if *Paul* comming to *Miletum* had sent from thence to *Ephesus*, for the Elders of that Church, and they had sent for the rest of the *Asian* Churches, & *Paul* had strayed at *Miletum* till they could assemble to him, this would have beene such an expence of time, as *Pauls* haste to *Jerusalem* could not admit. Secondly, these Elders were all of one Church made by God, Bishops over one flocke; and therefore may with most probability be affirmed to be the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus*. For the Apostles were alwaies exact in distinguishing Churches; that of a *City*, they alwaies called a *Church*; those of a *Province*, *Churches*; Churches of *Galatia*, Churches of *Macedonia*, Churches of *Judea*, &c. And that evasion which you use, page 122. that they might be all called one Church because *united under one government*, makes your cause farre worse. Because notwithstanding this union you speake of, *S. John* joyning them all together in one Epistle, *Revel.* 1. calls them the Churches of *Asia*, and now here the Church. Besides this, the Syriack translation (thought by some to be almost as ancient as the Church of *Antioch*) reads it, *the Elders of the Church of Ephesus*, not only the Elders of the Church. Thirdly, you say they were Bishops or Superintendents of other Churches as well as *Ephesus*. But your selfe grants in this very page, that *Timothy* was not yet

yet Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and yet you all ſay that he was the firſt Biſhop that ever *Epheſus* had. And that *Epheſus* was the *Metropolis* of all *Aſia*. How then came the *Daughter Churches* to have Biſhops before their mother as you call it. Laſtly, that we may cut aſunder the ſinewes (as your phraſe is) of your far-fetched anſwer, borrowed from Biſhop *Barlow* and *Andrewes*. Whereas you lay the weight of it upon thoſe words, *To all among whom I have gone preaching the Kingdome of God*. Collecting from thence, that there muſt be ſome *Superintendents* preſent from all thoſe places, where he had travelled preaching; Your ſelfe would quickly ſee the weakeneſſe of it, were you not pleading your owne cauſe. Should any man ſpeaking with three or foure of the members of the late convocation, ſay, you all who had your hand in the late oath and Canons are in danger, &c. would it imply a preſence of all the members of the Convocation becauſe the ſpeech concerned them all? you know it would not. But if this doe not ſuffice, then tell us, Why muſt his (*All*) be meant as ſuch ſuperintendents as you plead for, except becauſe they were called Biſhops, and ſo you would raiſe an argument from the *name* to the *thing*; which kind of argument if it may prevaile, you know your cauſe is loſt.

But the Acumen of this anſwer by which he makes account *to cut aſunder the ſinewes* of all our proofes, is this, That *it is more then probable, that Timothy and Titus were made Biſhops after Pauls firſt being at Rome*. Truely ſir, here you deſert your old friend, *Epiſc. by Div. right*, (out of whom you have hitherto borrowed a great part both of your matter and words. He ſaith, *Timothy* Page 97, 98. Epiſt. 2. part. p. 39.

was at this time a Bishop and present, and Pauls assessor. You it seemes thinke otherwise. Agree as well as you can; we will not set you at variance. We thinke hee was as much bishop before as after; onely we desire to learne when, where, and by whom *Timothy* received his ordination to Episcopacy: The first Epistle to *Timothy* tels us of an ordination which he had received to another office. And Chronologers tell us, that that Epistle was writ many yeeres before *Timothy* was made Bishop of *Ephesus*, according to your computation? and we leave to you to tell us when, and where he received ordination to your Episcopall office: we have perused the Chronologicall tables of *Ludovicus Capellus*, whom you call *Jacob Cappellus*, and have compared him with *Baronius*, & from thence have learned that the Epistle was writ to him before *Pauls* going to *Rome*, but cannot learne from their Chronologie that ever he was made Bishop afterwards.

Page 98. *The same answer* (say you) *may serve you for Titus*; and the same reply serves us: onely whereas you accuse us of guilt for our translating τὰ λοιπὰ τὰ (every variation from the ordinary translation must be guilty) know

Page 99. that τὰ λοιπὰ will be translated *things that remaine*, when you and we are dead and rotten And if our translators did not render τὰ λοιπὰ so, yet so they render τὰ λοιπὰ, *Revel.* 3, 2.

Your second quarrell is to these words (*for a while*) to which because our margent allots the space of betweene five or six yeeres, you thinke you have us at a great advantage. If wee had said he tarried there but a *little while*, you might have had somewhat whereon to fasten; but we spake of a *while*, not in respect of the

the shortnesse of his residence at *Creet*, but as it stands in opposition to residence for terme of life. He was left there but for a *while*. *Ergo* not fixed there during life. The end why the Apostle left *Titus* at *Creet* was to ordaine Elders or Bishops in every City, and not to be Bishop there himselfe. For as *Chrysostome* saith, *Paul would not commit the whole Iland to one man, but would have every man appointed to his charge and Cure. For so he knew his labour would be the lighter, and the people that were under him would be governed with the greater diligence. For the Teacher should not be troubled with the government of many Churches, but onely intend one, and study for to adorne that.* Therefore this was *Titus* his worke, not to be Bishop in *Creet* himselfe, but to ordaine Elders in every City, which was an office above that of a Bishop. For *Creet* was ἑκατόμπολις; Now you know sir, that it is above the worke of an ordinary Bishop to plant and erect Churches to their due frame, in an hundred Cities. Bishops are given to particular Churches when they are framed to keepe them in the Apostolicall truth, not to lay foundations, or to exædifie some imperfect beginnings. This service *Titus* did in *Creet*, (the same worke which the Apostle did when he visited the Churches of *Asia*, *Acts* 14. 23.) which being finished, the same Apostolicall power which sent him thither, removed him thence againe for the service of other Churches, as we have formerly shewed from Scripture. And though the Remonstrant tels us this calling away could no whit have impeached the truth of his Episcopacy; We must crave leave to tell him, that though it may be one journey upon some extraordinary Church service might

Chrys. in Tit. c. 1. Hom. 2.

consist with such a fixed station as Episcopacy is. Yet an ordinary frequent course of jorneying, such as *Titus* his was cannot; unlesse he will grant that *Timothy* might be a Bishop and an Evangelist at the same time. But this is contrary to the Remonstrants one definition of an Evangelist, page 94. And therefore he chuseth rather to say *Timothy* was first an *Evangelist when he travelled abroad, and afterward a Bishop when he* Page 100. *setled at home*. This is more absurd then the former. For if ever *Titus* were a Bishop; it was then when *Paul* left him in *Creet* to ordaine Elders in every City: And after that time was the greatest part of his travels, Ansr. p. 51. as we have shewed in our answer. All these journeys did *Titus* make after he was left in *Creet*, nor doe we finde any where record of his returne thither: Therefore according to this rule, *Titus* should be first a Bishop, and afterwards an Evangelist. Or if the greatest part of *Titus* his travels had beene before his delegation to *Creet*, yet it had beene no lesse absurd to say that afterwards he did descend from the degree of an Evangelist to the station of Episcopacy. We hope the Remonstrant will not deny but an Evangelist was Ἐγερσυλία. as farre above a Bishop as any Bishop can fancy himselfe to be above a Presbyter. And if for a Bishop to quit his Episcopacy and suffer himselfe to be reduced to the ranke of a meere Presbyter, be a crime so hainous, so odious, Epis. Div. Rig. part 2. *that it had beene much better to have beene unborne then to live to give so hainous a scandall to Gods Church, and so deepe a wound to his holy truth and ordinances, a river, an ocean can neither drowne nor wash off the offence*. What is it to reduce an Evangelist to the forme of a Bishop?

We

We had granted that ſome Fathers call *Timothy* and *Titus* Biſhops; the Remonſtrant replies, *ſome, nay all.* Be it ſo, as long as himſelfe hath granted the Fathers did uſe the titles of Biſhops and Presbyters *indifferently.* But there is a *Cloud of witneſſes of much antiquity which avers Timothy and Titus to have liv d and died Biſhop of Epheſus & Creet.* But this cloud will ſoone blow over. The Magdeburgenſes tell us, That there is nothing expreſſely or certainely delivered by any approved writer to ſhew how, or how long *Timothy* was Doctour or Governour of the Church of *Epheſus.* Therefore we cannot certainely affirme that he ſuffered martyrdome at *Epheſus*, being ſtoned to death for reproving the idolatry of the *Epheſians* at the porch of *Dianas* Temple, which yet the moſt have reported. Let the Reader further know that his cloud of witneſſes, who averre *Timothy* and *Titus* to be Biſhops, have borrowed their teſtimonies from *Euſebius*, of whom *Scaliger* ſaith, and Doctor *Raynolds* approves of it. That he read ancient *Hiſtories parum attente*, which they prove by many inſtances. And all that *Euſebius* ſaith, is onely *ſic ſcribitur.* It is ſo reported. But from whence had he this Hiſtory? even from *Clemens* fabulous, and *Hegeſippus* not exſtant. And therefore that, which is anſwered by our learned Divines concerning *Peters* being at *Rome* and dying there (which is alſo recorded by *Euſebius*) That becauſe *Euſebius* had it from *Papias* an Author of little eſteeme: hence they thinke it a ſufficient argument to deny the truth of the Hiſtory, though aſſerted by never ſo many Authours relying upon one of ſo little credit. The ſame anſwer will fully ſerve to all the authorities pro-

Centur. 1, lib 2. cap. 10.

'Ιησοῦς.

produced for *Timothies and Titus* being Bishops from antiquity. And that which *Thucidides* saith of the ancient Greeke Historians, may as truely be said of *Eusebius Irenæus* and others: *Quæ a majoribus acceperant posteri, ea ἀκριβείᾳ, securi examinis suis item posteris tradiderunt.*

We further shewed how the Fathers called *Timothy* and *Titus* Bishops. *viz.* in the same *sence which learned D. Raynolds saies, they also used to call the Apostles Bishops, even in a generall signification, because they did attend that Church for a time. &c.* This the Remonstrant will not give us leave to doe, but without his leave we shall make it good. We say therefore further: That when the Apostles or Evangelists (perhaps *James* at *Hierusalem*, *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, *Titus* at *Creet*) did stay longer at one Church, and exercised such a power, as the Bishops in succeeding ages did aspire unto: when the Fathers would set forth this power of an Apostle or Evangelists long residing in one Church, they (labouring to doe it in a familiar way) did similitudinarily call them Bishops, and sometimes Archbishops or Patriarcks, which all confesse were offices not heard of in the Apostles times; not meaning they were so formally, but eminently: neither could they call them so properly, for the power they exercised was in them formally Apostolicall or Evangelicall, reaching not only to the Church where then they resided, but to all neighbouring and bordering Churches, as farre as was possible for them to oversee, or the occasions of the Church did require; they having no bounded Dioceses, but had the care of all the Churches. In this sence they might call them so, but for either an Apostle

Apoſtle or Evangeliſt to be ordained a Biſhop or Preſbyter had beene both unneceſſary and abſurd: unneceſſary, becauſe the higher degree includes the inferiour eminently, though not formally; and abſurd to deſcend lower, that after they had been Apoſtolically or Evangelically employed in taking care of all the Churches, they ſhould be ordained to a worke which ſhould ſo limit them, as to make them leſſe uſefull to the Church of God.

But, ſaith he, *all this diſcourſe is needleſſe, whether Timothy or Titus were Evangeliſts or no; ſure we are, here they ſtand for perſons charged with thoſe offices and cares which are delivered to the ordinary Church-governours in all ſucceeding generations*: Here firſt you give us no ground of your ſureneſſe, nor can give us any other then what may be ſaid of the Apoſtles, *for they alſo ſtand as perſons charged, &c.* Secondly, it is true the ſubſtance of thoſe cares and offices, which belong to Apoſtles and Evangeliſts is tranſmitted to the ordinary Church-governours, as farre as is neceſſary for the edification of the Church, elſe the Lord had not ſufficiently provided for his Church: all the queſtion is, whether theſe Church-governours are by way of Ariſtocracy the common Councell of Presbyters, or by way of Monarchy Dioceſan Biſhops? Now unleſſe you prove that *Timothy* and *Titus* were ordinary officers (or as Doctor *Hall* cals them, Dioceſan Biſhops) to whom as to individuall perſons ſuch care and offices were individually intruſted, you will never out of *Timothy and Titus* defend Dioceſan Biſhops. Thirdly, though the ſubſtance of theſe cares and offices were to be tranſmitted to ordinary Church-governours,

yet they are not tranſmitted in that eminency or perſonall height, in which they were in the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts: an Apoſtle where ever he lived might governe and command all Evangeliſts, all Presbyters &c. an Evangeliſt might governe all Presbyters, &c. but no Presbyter or Biſhop might command others, onely the common Councel of Presbyters may charge any or many Presbyters, as occaſion ſhall require. In a word, theſe ordinary Church-governours ſucceed the extraordinary officers, not in the ſame line and degree, as one brother dying, another ſucceeds him in the inheritance; but as men of an other order, and in a different line. Let the Remonſtrant therefore *take Timothy and Titus as he findes them*, that is, Evangeliſts, men of extraordinary dignity and authority in the Church of Chriſt: Let him *with his firſt confidence maintaine that our Biſhops challenge no other ſpirituall power then was delegated to them.* We ſhall upon better grounds maintaine, with better confidence, that if they chalenge the ſame, they ought to be diſclaimed for uſurpers.

But much more challenging ſuch a power as was never exerciſed by *Timothy* and *Titus*, as we demonſtrated in our former anſwer in ſeverall inſtances; which are ſo commonly knowne as our Remonſtrant is aſhamed to deny them: onely plaies them off, partly with his old ſhift, *the abuſe of the perſon, not of the Calling.* But we beſeech you ſir, tell us whether theſe perſons doe not perpetrate theſe abuſes (though by their owne vice, yet) by vertue of their place and Callings. Partly by retorting queſtions upon us; *when, or where did our Biſhops challenge to ordaine alone; or to governe*

governe alone? we have ſhewed you when and where already, *when or where did our Biſhops challenge power to paſſe a rough and unbeſeeming rebuke upon an Elder?* Sure your owne conſcience can tell that hath taught you to apply that to an Elder in office which we onely ſpake (in Scripture phraſe) of an Elder in generall. It was your guilt, not our ignorance that turned it to an Elder in office. *Where did,* ſay you, *our Biſhops give Commiſſion to Chancellors, Commiſſaries, &c. to ryle upon Presbyters, to accuſe them without juſt ground, &c.* where have not Chancellors done ſo? and what power have they but by Biſhops Commiſſion to meddle with any thing in Church affaires? And where is the Biſhop that hath forbid it them? *Qui non prohibet facit.* Onely there is one practice of our Biſhops he is ſomething more laborious to juſtifie: That is, their caſting out unconforming brethren, commonly knowne in their Court language by the name of ſchiſmatickes and heretickes, which *Timothy* and *Titus* never did, nor had any ſuch power delegated to them; heretickes indeed the Apoſtles gave them power to reject: but wee had hoped the refuſall of the uſe of a ceremony ſhould never have beene equalized in the puniſhment either to hereſie or ſchiſme. But the Remonſtrant hath found Scripture for it. *Doth not the Apoſtle wiſh that they were cut off that trouble you?* but ſure it is one thing to wiſh men cut off by God, and another thing to cut them off by the cenſure of the Church. Beſides this was written to the Galatians; and they that troubled them, were ſuch as maintained doctrines againſt the foundation, *i.* Juſtification by workes of the Law, &c. which we thinke are very neere of kinne to here- Page 102.

tickes. I am sure farre above the crime of the Remonstrants *unconforming brethren*, who are unsetled in points of a meane difference, (which their usuall language knowes by no better termes then of schismatickes and factious) yet even such have fallen under the heaviest censures of suspension, excommunication, deprivation, &c. which the Remonstrant unable to deny would justifie, which when he shall be able to doe, he may do something towards the patronizing of Bishops. But in the meane time let him not say they are our owne ill raised suggestions, but their owne ill assumed and worse mannaged authority, that makes them feare to be disclaimed as usurpers.

The second Scripture ground which the Remonstrant is ambitious to draw in for the support of his Episcopall cause, is the instance of the Angels of the seven Churches, which becaus it is *locus* πολυϋλητος and cried up as *argumentum verè Achilleum*, we did on purpose inlarge our selves about it. And for our paines the Remonstrant, as if all learning and acutenesse were lockt up in his breast (*Narcissus* like in love with his owne shadow) professeth *that this peece of the taske fell unhappily upon some dull and tedious hand, &c.* Page 103. Which if it be so, it will redound the more to the Remonstrants discredit, when it shall appeare that he is so shamefully foiled and wounded by so dull an adversary. He objects *Colewort's oft sod*, when he cannot but know that the whole substance of his owne booke is borrowed from Bishop *Bilson* and Doctor *Downham*. And that there is nothing in this discourse about the Angels, but either it is καινὸν; or if κοινὸν, it is κοινὸν καὶ ὠφελιμον. But before we come to answer our Remonstants particulars

particulars

ticulars, we will premiſe ſomething in generall about theſe *Aſian* Angels.

It may ſeeme ſtrange that the defenders of Epiſcopacy lay ſo much weight of argument upon the word or appellation of *Angell*; which themſelves know to be a title not impropriated to the chiefe Miniſters of the Church, but common to all that bring the glad tidings of the Goſpell; yea to all the meſſengers of the Lord of Hoſts. We conceive there are 2. maine reaſons that induce them to inſiſt ſo much on this: Firſt, they finde it the moſt eaſie way of avoyding the dint of all the Arguments brought againſt them out of the Hiſtory of the Acts and Epiſtles, by placing one above the reſt of the Presbyters in the period of the Apoſtles times. And ſo finding in the Revelation (which was written the laſt of all the parts of the Scripture, except peradventure the Goſpell written by the ſame penne) an expreſſion which may ſeeme to favour their cauſe, they improve it to the utmoſt. Partly becauſe hereby they evade all our arguments which we bring out of the Scripture. Doe we prove out of the 20. of *Acts*, Presbyters and Biſhops to be all one? Doe we prove the Biſhops deſcribed in *Timothy* and *Titus* to be one and the ſame in name and office with a Presbyter? Doe we prove that their Churches were all governed *Communi Conſilio Presbyterorum?* All ſhall be granted us, and yet the Divine right of Epiſcopacy be ſtill held up by this ſleight, by telling us, that before the Apoſtles left the earth they made over their authority to ſome prime men. Demand where this is extant? The Angels of the ſeven Churches are pleaded preſently. And partly becauſe we have no other Scripture

of latter inſpiration and edition, whereby to prove the contrary.

Another inducement is, becauſe the writers neere the Apoſtles times make frequent mention of a Biſhop, and as they would have us beleeve, ſome waies diſtinguiſhed from a Presbyter. Some of them mentioning the very men that were the Angels of theſe Churches; as *Polycarpus* of *Smyrna* & *Ignatius* (who is ſaid to have beene martyred within twelve yeeres after the Revelation was written,) wrote letters to the ſeverall Churches, wherein he mentioneth their Biſhops diſtinct from their Presbyters. Now (ſaith the author of *Epiſcopacy by divine right*) the Apoſtles immediate *ſucceſſors could beſt tell what they next before them did. Who can better tell a mans pace then he that followes him cloſe at heeles?* And this hath ſo plauſible a ſhew, that all are condemned as blind, or wilfull, who will either doubt that Epiſcopacy was of Apoſtolicall inſtitution, or thinke that the Church of Chriſt, ſhould in ſo ſhort a time deviate from the inſtitution of the Apoſtles. But now how inſufficient a ground this is for the raiſing up of ſo mighty a Fabricke as Epiſcopacy by Divine right, or Apoſtolicall inſtitution wee deſire the Reader to judge by that that followes.

Epiſc. by Di. Right, 1 pt. 35.

Firſt, the thing they lay as their foundation is a meere metaphoricall word, and ſuch as is ordinarily applied to Presbyters in common.

Secondly, the Penman of thoſe ſeven Epiſtles did never in them nor in any of his other writings ſo much as uſe the name of Biſhop, he names Presbyters frequently; eſpecially in this booke, yea where he would

ſet

ſet out the office of thoſe that are neereſt to the throne of Chriſt in his Church, *Revel.* 4. And whereas in Saint *Johns* daies ſome new expreſſions were uſed in the Chriſtian Church, which were not in Scripture: As the Chriſtian Sabbath began to be called ἡμέρα κυριακὴ and Chriſt himſelfe Ὁ Λόγος. Now both theſe are found in the writings of S. *John*; and it is ſtrange to us that the Apoſtle ſhould mention a new phraſe, and not mention a new office erected in the Church, as you would make us beleeve.

Neither thirdly, in any of his writings the leaſt intimation of ſuperiority of one Presbyter over another, ſave onely where he names *Diotrephes* as one ambitiouſly affecting ſuch a Primacy. Nor is there any one word in theſe Epiſtles whence an Epiſcopall authority may be collected. So that did not the teſtimonies that lived ſoone after make the argument plauſible, it would appeare ridiculous. But alas the ſuffrage of all the writers in the world is infinitely unable to command an Act of Divine faith without which divine right cannot be apprehended.

Suppoſe we were as verily perſwaded that *Ignatius* wrote the Epiſtles which goe under his name (which yet we have juſt cauſe to doubt of, as knowing that many learned men reject a great part of them, and ſome all) as we can be perſwaded that *Tully* wrote his: All this can perſwade no further that the Apoſtles ordained and appointed Biſhops as their ſucceſſors, but onely by a humane faith: but neither is that ſo. The moſt immediate and unqueſtionable ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles give cleare evidence to the contrary. It is granted on all ſides that there is no peece of antiquity

tiquity that deserves more esteeme then the Epistle of *Clement*, lately brought to light *by the industry and labour of that learned Gentleman Master Patricke Young*. And in that Epistle Bishops and Presbyters are all one, as appeares by what followes: The occasion of that Epistle seemes to be a new sedition raysed by the *Corinthians* against their Presbyters, page 57.58. (not as Bishop *Hall* saies, *the continuation of the schismes amongst them in the Apostles daies:*) *Clemens* to remove their present sedition tels them how God hath alwaies appointed severall orders in his Church, which must not be confounded; first, telling them how it was in the Jewish Church; then for the times of the Gospell, tels them, that Christ sent his Apostles through Countries and Cities, *in which they constituted the first fruits* (or the chiefe of them) *unto Bishops and Deacons, for them who should beleeve afterward*, p.54.55.

For the further high commendation of *Clement* and this his peece, See *Epis. by div right* part 2 sect.10. p.59,60. Whom yet he hath wronged in his quotations.

Those whom hee calls there Bishops afterwards throughout the Epistle he cals Presbyters, pa.58,62, 69. All which places doe evidently convince that in *Clement* his judgement, the Apostle appointed but two officers (that is Bishops and Deacons) to bring men to beleeve: Because when he had reckoned up three orders appointed by God among the Jewes, High-priests, Priests, and Levites, comming to recite orders appointed by the Apostles under the Gospell, hee doth mention onely Bishops and Deacons: and those Bishops which at first he opposeth to Deacons, ever after he cals Presbyters. And here we cannot but wonder at the strange boldnesse of the author of *Epis. by divine right*, who hath endevoured *to wire-draw* this Author (so much magnified by him) to maintaine his

his Prelaticall Episcopacy: and that both by *foysting* in the word *withall* into this translation which is not in the Text, that the Reader might be seduced to beleeve that the offices of Episcopacy and Presbytery were two different offices. And also by willingly misunderstanding *Clement* his phrase ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς: for by the word (ἐπισκοπῆς) he would have us understand Episcopacy as distinct from Presbyterie: whereas the whole series of the Epistle evidently proves that the word *Episcopus & Presbyter* are ἰσοδυναμοῦντα: And so also by the word (ὀνόματι) hee would have us to understand that the contention then in *Corinth* was only about the name: whereas it appeares by the Epistle it selfe, that the controversie was not about the name, but dignity of *Episcopacy:* for it was about the deposition of their godly Presbyters, p. 57, 58. And the word ὄνομα is thus interpreted by *Beza Eph.* 1. 21. *Phil.* 2. 9. & *Heb.* 1. 4. and *Mead* in *Apoc.* 11. p. 156. In which places ὄνομα is rendred by ἀξίωμα, so here ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς is put for ἀξιώματι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. By all this we see that the most genuine and neerest successor of the Apostles knew no such difference.

Lastly, it is worth our observation, that the same writers who (as they say) testifie that these 7. Angels were in a superiour degree to Presbyters, do likewise affirm that the Apostle *Iohn* sate many yeeres B. of *Ephesus*, and was the Metropolitan of all *Asia*, in which we suppose the Remonstrant will allow his readers a liberty of beleeving him, and allow us a liberty to tell him that D *Whitakers* saith, *Patres cum Jacobum Episcopum vocant aut etiam Petrum, non propriè sumunt Episcopi nomen, sed vocant eos Episcopos illarum Ecclesiarum in quibus aliquamdiu commorati sunt.* And in the same place, *Whitak. de Pontif. qu. 2. cap 15.*

Et ſi propriè de Epiſcopo loquatur, abſurdum eſt Apoſtolos fuiſſe Epiſcopos. Nam qui propriè Epiſcopus eſt, is Apoſtolus non poteſt eſſe, quia Epiſcopus eſt unius tantum Eccleſiæ. At Apoſtoli plurium Eccleſiarum fundatores & inſpectores erant. And againe, *Hoc enim non multum diſtat ab inſaniâ, dicere Petrum fuiſſe propriè Epiſcopum, aut reliquos Apoſtolos.*

Now we returne to our Remonſtrant. Our anſwer to his objection from the Angels was: That the word *Angell* is to be taken *collectively*, not *individually*, which he cals, *pro more ſuo, a ſhift and a conceit which no wiſe man can ever beleeve.* And yet he could not but take notice that we alleaged *Auſtin, Gregory, Fulke, Perkins, Fox, Brightman, Mede*, and divers others for this interpretation: which will make the world to accuſe him for want of wiſdome, for calling the wiſedome of ſuch men into queſtion. Before he addreſſeth himſelf to anſwer our reaſons, he propounds two queres.

Page 104. Page 104.

1. *If the intereſt be common and equally appertaining to all, why ſhould one be ſingled out above the reſt?* A very *dull* queſtion, which is indeed a very begging of the cauſe. For the queſtion in agitation is, whether when Chriſt writes to the 7. Angels, he meant to ſingle out 7. *individuall* perſons above the reſt, or elſe writes to the 7. Angels *collectively* meaning all the *Angels* that were in all the Churches.

The ſecond queſtion is as *dull* as the firſt. *If you will yeeld the perſon to be ſuch as had more then others, a right in the adminiſtration of all, it is that weſeeke for.* But he knew we would not yield it. And therefore we may juſtly uſe his owne words, *that thoſe queſtions are tedious and might well have beene ſpared.* And ſo alſo the inſtances *of a letter indorſed from the Lords of the*

the Councell to the Biſhop of Durham, concerning ſome affaires of the whole Clergy of his Dioceſſe: No man will deny but that the Biſhop of *Durham* is an individuall Biſhop. This example ſuppoſeth the Angell about whom we diſpute to be meant individually, which you know is the τὸ ζητούμενον betweene you and us. *Quid hæc ad Rhombum?* We will give you inſtances more ſuitable to the purpoſe. Suppoſe one in Chriſts time, or his Apoſtles had indorſed a letter to the Chiefe-prieſt concerning the affaires of the *Sanhedrim*, and another letter to the chiefe Ruler of the Synagogue concerning the affaires of the Synagogue, and another letter to the Captaine of the Temple, concerning the buſineſſe of the Temple; could any man imagine but that theſe indorſments muſt neceſſarily be underſtood *collectively?* conſidering there were more Chiefe-prieſts then one in *Ieruſalem*, *Luke* 22. 4. and more chiefe Rulers of the Synagogue then one, *Math.* 19. 18. compared with *Acts* 18. 8. 17. And more Captaines of the Temple then one, *Acts* 4. 1. compared with *Luke* the 22. 4. and ſo alſo ſemblably more Angels and Miniſters in the ſeven Churches then ſeven. But ſtay ſir, we hope you are not of opinion, that any of your *Aſian Biſhops* had as much ſpirituall and temporall power as the Lord Biſhop of *Salisbury*, and the Lord Biſhop and Palatine of *Durham*, *Cave dixeris.*

At laſt you come to our proofes, which you ſcoffingly call *invincible.* You ſhould have done better to have called them *irrefragable*, like your good friends *irrefragable propoſitions.*

Our firſt argument is drawne from the Epiſtle to *Thyatira*, *Revel.* 2. 24. *But I ſay unto you* (in the plurall

number, not unto thee in the ſingular) *and unto the reſt in Thyatira.* Here is a plaine diſtinction betweene the *Governours*, and the *governed.* And the *Governours* in the plurall number; which apparently proves that the Angell is *collective.* The Remonſtrant hath no way to put this off, but by a *pittifull ſhift* to uſe his owne words. He tels us he hath found *a better coppy*; which is a very unhappy and unbecoming expreſſion, apt to make ignorant people doubt of the originall text, and ſo in time rather to deny the Divinity of the *Scriptures*, then *of Epiſcopacy.* But this better coppy is but lately ſearcht into, for we finde that Biſhop *Hall*, in his *Epiſcopacy by Divine right*, reads it as we doe. But *I ſay unto you, and the reſt in Thyatira.* But what is this better Coppy? *It is a Manuſcript written by the hand of Teclæ*; which if it be no truer then *Itinerarium Pauli & Teclæ*, it will have little credit among the Learned. But that which makes you to magnifie it the more, is that doughty argument which it helped you to againſt us, concerning the ſame Church of *Thyatira*, in which the Angell is charged *for ſuffering that woman Iezabel.* And now you ſay, *in that memorable copy of Tecla, it is* τὴν γυναῖκα σου Ἰεζάβελ, which you interpret, *thy wife Iezebel.* And juſt as *Archimedes*, you come with an εὕρηκα εὕρηκα, *And call upon us to bluſh for ſhame.* What ſay you in a different character, *ſhall we thinke ſhe was wife to the whole company or to one Biſhop alone?* But for our part we doe thinke you have more cauſe to bluſh for making ſuch a Tranſlation, and rather then you will not prove the Angell of *Thyatira* to be an individuall Biſhop, you will *un-Angell* him, and make him an other *Ahab*, to marry a curſed *Iezebel.* We wonder that never

Page 105.

Page 106. The memorable copy of *Teclaes* may be tranſlated, *Thy woman Iezebel*, or *That woman of thine Iezebel.* We ſee no ſhadow of reaſon

ver any protestant writer had the wit to bring this text against the papists to prove the lawfulnesse of Priests marriages; no not Doctor *Hall* himselfe in his defence of the married Clergy. Give us leave here to use your owne words, page 108. *Forbeare Reader if you can, to smile at this curious subtilty, what Cabalisme have we here? judge Reader what to expect of so deepe speculations.* And also to repeate what you say, page 110. *If you please your selfe with this new subtilty it is well from us you have no cause to expect an answer: it can neither draw our assent, nor merit our confutation.* We beleeve it to be as true that *Jezebel* was the wife of the Bishop of *Thyatira*, as that *Tecla* was the wife of *Paul.* But to returne to the former text: Let any judicious reader survey the latter part of the 23. verse (which is the verse before that out of which we bring our reason) there he shall finde Christ speaking to the Church of *Thyatira*, saith: *And I will give to every one of you* (in the plurall number.) And then followes, *But I say unto you and the rest in Thyatira.* And he will not onely confesse that though the 24. verse should faile, yet the 23. would prove the same thing, as effectually as the 24. but also will grant that from the coherence it is evident that the old copies are better then that which this Remonstrant cals the better coppy of *Tecla.* But besides this text, let the Reader cast his eye upon what Christ saith to the Angell of the Church of *Smyrna*, *Revel.* 2. 10. *Feare none of those things which thou shalt suffer, behold the divell shall cast some of you into prison,* (of you in the plurall number:) *that yee may be tryed* (yee in the plurall number) *and you* (in the plurall againe) *shall have tribulation ten daies; be thou faithfull*

why the Remonstrant should translate it, *Thy wife Iezebel.* In the Arabick it is, *Quod servisti mulierem vocatam Iezebel,* according to our ordinary Greeke copies.

unto the death, and I will give thee a Crowne of life. Observe here how our Saviour Christ changeth the number. *Be thou faithfull. And the divell shall cast some of you, &c.* to shew unto us, that the *Angell* is not meant of one singular person, but of all the whole company of Presbyters that were in *Smyrna.* So also Christ writing to the Angell of the Church of *Pergamus* saith, verse 13. in the beginning of the verse, *I know thy workes*, in the singular number; but in the latter end, *who was slaine among you*, in the plurall number. We expect that the Remonstrant will when best at leasure bring tidings of *another better coppy*, to avoyd the dint of these texts that doe as we thinke demonstratively prove the thing in question.

Our second argument is drawne from the like phrases even in this very booke of the Revelation, where it is usuall to expresse a company under one singular person; as the civill state of *Rome*, as opposite to Christ, is called a beast with ten hornes: and the Ecclesiasticall state Antichristian, is called, the whore of Babylon. To which you answer. 1. *That if it be thus in visions and Emblematicall representations, must it needs be so in plaine narrations?* But good sir consider, this very thing we are about was seene by Saint *Iohn* in *a vision:* and you your selfe confesse in the next page, that the word *Angell* is *metaphoricall. How then is it a plaine narration?* Secondly, you say *because it is so in one phrase of speech, must it be so in all?* We answer, that this argument was not brought to prove that the word *Angell* must needs be taken *collectively*, but onely that it might be so taken, and that it was the likeliest interpretation, especially considering what was added out

Page 106.

Page 106.

of

of Maſter *Mede* (who was better skilled in the meaning of the Revelation then your ſelfe) that the word *Angell* is commonly (if not alwaies) in the Revelation taken *collectively*. Thus the ſeven Angels that blew the ſeven trumpets, and the ſeven Angels that poured out the ſeven vials, are not literally to be taken, but Synecdochically, you reply. *Perhaps ſo, but then the Synecdoche lies in the ſeven, not in the Angels*, and ſo you grant *the word Angell to be metaphoricall, but we are never a whit the neerer to our imagined Synecdoche.* But this is but a meere fallacy. Let but the reader expect, till we make good our fourth reaſon, and then we ſhall ſee our imagined Synecdoche made reall. For the preſent it is ſufficient, that it is the ordinary cuſtome of the holy Ghoſt in the Revelation, by Angell to meane Angels; by ſeven Angels, not ſeven individually, but collectively. But whether the Synecdoche be in the word ſeven, or in the word Angel, that is nothing to the purpoſe in hand.

Our third argument, is drawne from the word *Angell*, which is a common name to all the Miniſters and meſſengers, &c. And ſurely had Chriſt intended to point out ſome one individuall perſon by the *Angell*, he would have uſed ſome diſtinguiſhing name to ſet him out by: he would have called him *Rector*, or *Preſident*, or *Superintendent*; but calling him by a name common to all Miniſters, why ſhould we thinke that there ſhould be any thing ſpoken to him that doth not aſmuch concerne all the reſt who are Angels as well as he? All *that* you anſwer is, *that Chriſt knew this well enough, and if he had meant it, had it not beene as eaſie to have mentioned many as one?* But here wee humbly Page 107.

deſire

desire the Reader to consider two things. 1. The unreasonablenesse of this answer: we brought three reasons why Christ when he meant divers Angels, spake in the singular number *Angell*, not *Angels*. These reasons the Remonstrant passeth over with a scorne, (the commonest, safest, surest way of answering, the Remonstrant hath:) and yet he demands page 104. *why should one be singled out above all, if the interest be common?* And here, *why doth not Christ say to the Angels?* But let him first answer our *Therefores*, and wee will quickly answer his *Wherefores*. Secondly, how justly we may retort this answer upon the Remonstrant and say, If Christ had meant by the seven *Angels* seven *Bishops*, how easie had it beene for him to have written to the *Bishop of Ephesus* (as he was lately called at the Spittle by a Bishop) to the *Bish. of Smyrna*, instead of the Angell of *Ephesus*, and the Angell of *Smyrna*. But this Christ doth not doe, and not onely so, but Saint *Iohn* also in all his bookes makes not any mention of the name Bishop. And therefore it seemeth strange to us that Episcopacy by divine right should be fetched out of his writings. I but saith the Remonstrant, it is written Page 107. ὁ Ἄγγελος. *And therefore the denoted person must needs be singular. For surely you cannot say that all the Presbyters at Ephesus were one Angell.* Yes sir, wee can say they were all one Angell *collectively*, though not *individually* And we can shew you where Christ speaketh in the singular number, and joyneth the Article with it also, and yet meaneth Synecdochically more, for one, as *Iohn* 4.37. *Iohn* 10.11. ὁ σπείρων, ὁ θεὶς ζῶν, ὁ κλέπτης, ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς, which must be all meant indefinitely, not individually. You suppose againe, that if that Christ

Chriſt had ſaid, *To the Starre of Epheſus, no body would have conſtrued it but of one eminent perſon.* But herein alſo you are much miſtaken, for the word *Starre* is as common a name to all Miniſters as the word *Angell*, as we have ſhewed in our anſwer.

The fourth argument you account *ridiculous*, and in a proud ſcorne *paſſe it over with a jeere.* But you will ſee in the concluſion you your ſelfe to be the *ridiculum caput*, not we. Our argument ſtands thus: Our Saviour ſaith, *The ſeven Candleſticks which thou ſaweſt are the ſeven Churches*; but he doth not ſay, *the ſeven ſtarres are the ſeven Angels of the ſame Churches.* But the *Angels* of the *ſeven Churches* omitting not without myſtery the number of the Angels, leaſt wee ſhould underſtand by Angell one Miniſter alone, and not a company. To omit your ſcoffes, you anſwer it is plaine that *every Church hath his Angell mentioned, and there being ſeven Churches, how many Angels (I beſeech you) are there?* This anſwer is as eaſily blowne away, as the wind blowes away chaffe. It is true, every Church hath his Angell mentioned, but whether Angell individually or Angell collectively, that is ſtill the queſtion, and therefore for ought you ſay, though there were but ſeven Churches, there might be ſeven, and ſeven times ſeven Angels in thoſe Churches. But you intimate that Chriſt ſaith, *the 7. ſtarres*, though he doth not ſay the ſeven Angels. Now here give us leave to put our Remonſtrant in mind of the *imagined Synecdoche.* For we juſtly conceive that theſe words, *The ſeven Starres are the Angels*, are figurative, and that there are two figures in them, a metaphor in the word Starre and Angell,

Page 108.

and a Synecdoche in the word ſeven. For we doe not thinke that the ſeven Starres ſignifie ſeven individuall Angels, for then indeed the reader might have juſtly ſmiled at our curious ſpeculation, but we thinke them to be taken collectively. Thus *Revel.* 8. 2. *John ſaw ſeven Angels which ſtood before God*, by which ſeven Angels Doctor *Reynolds* doth not underſtand ſeven individuall Angels, but by a Synecdoche all the Angels. For there are no ſeven particular Angels that doe ſtand before God, but all doe ſo, *Dan.* 7. The words of Doctor *Reynolds* are theſe, *Quare cum commune ſit omnibus electis Angelis Dei ſtare coram throno, videtur nomine ſeptem Angelorum ſignificari univerſos Angelos Dei.* Item, *Ita numero ſeptenario ſæpe ſignificari omnes, numerum ſaltem infinitum numero finito docent, ſeptem columnæ Pro.* 9. *ſeptem paſtores Math.* 5. *ſeptem oculi Zach.* 3. *ſed imprimis in iſtis myſteriis Apocalypſeos, ſeptem Candelabra, ſeptem lampades, ſeptem phyalæ, ſeptem plagæ.* And now let the Reader judge whether this argument be ſo ridiculous as the mocking Remonſtrant would make it.

Cenſura lib. Apocryph. præl. 64

But that you may ſee how dull the anſwerer himſelfe, is whilſt he accuſeth others of *dulneſſe*, let us a little conſider what *pittifull ſhifts* he uſeth in his anſwer to our laſt reaſon.

Our laſt argument is; Though but one *Angell* be mentioned in the forefront, yet it is evident the Epiſtles themſelves are dedicated to all the Angels and Miniſters in every Church, and to the Churches themſelves: and if unto the whole Church, much more unto the Presbyters of that Church. To this you anſwer.

1. By granting the argument which is to grant the cauſe,

cause; as will appeare to any judicious Reader: For the reason doth not onely say that the whole Church is concerned in the Epistles and spoken unto in them, but that they are dedicated to all the Ministers as well as one, & to all the Churches as well as to the Angels, as appeares *Reuel.* 1.11. *send it to the seven Churches:* and also by the Epiphonema of every Epistle, *he that hath an eare to heare, let him heare what the Spirit saith to the Churches*, not onely *concerning* the Churches, but *to the* Churches. But then you argue secondly, *if every* Page 109. *Epistle be written to all the Churches, then we must say that every of these seven Angels must be the whole company of all the seven Churches, which were a foule nonsence.* But you must understand that though every Epistle be written to all the Churches, yet not *eodem modo.* As for example; the Epistle to *Ephesus* was written *primariò, proprie & formaliter* to the Church of *Ephesus*, but to the other Churches onely, *reflexive & per modum exempli.* And therefore we returne your nonsence upon your selfe. For we doe not confound the *Angels and the Churches* (we know there is a distinction betweene the Starres and the Candlesticks) but we affirme that the Epistles are written to the *Churches* as well as to the *Angels*, and to all the Angels as well as to any one.

Thirdly, you say *we might have saved the labour both* Page 109. *of Ausbertus and the rest of our Authours, and our owne.* But surely unlesse you meant to yeeld the cause, you would never say so. For we proved out of *Ausbertus*, that according to his judgement, by *Angell* is meant the *whole Church.* And out of *Perkins, Brightman, Fulke, Fox, Iustin, Gregory, Primasius, Hamo, Beda, Richard, Thomas*, &c. That the word *Angell* is to be taken not

individually, but *collectively*. And further we shewed that in these seven Epistles where one person is singled out and spoken unto in particular, either by way of praise or dispraise; that such places are not to be understood of one individuall person, but of the whole company of the Ministers in all things equall with that our Angell: which are proved by such reasons, which because you knew not how to answer, you say *we might have saved our labour*; and in that indeed we should have saved your credit, but have done the cause much prejudice.

Lastly, you say *satis Magisterialiter* (for you prove it not) *That there are such particularities both of commendations and exceptions in the body of the severall Epistles as cannot but have relation to those severall overseers to whom they were indorsed, as you have elsewhere specified.* But whom *you* are, and where this is specified you refuse to tell us. Onely you put us to answer: *Had all the Presbyters of Ephesus lost their first love? Had each of them tried the false Apostles? Had all those of Sardis a name to live and were dead? Were all the Laodicean Ministers of one temper?* You say, *no doubt* it was otherwise. But this is Αὐτόξυλον. We say, No doubt that not onely the Presbyters of *Ephesus*, *Sardis*, *Laodicea*, but that the whole Church had lost their first love, and were become lukewarme, and had a name to live and were dead, (wee say all that is *genera singulorum*, not *singula generum*) and this wee prove. Because the punishment threatned by Christ is threatned not onely against that one *Angell*, but against all the Church, *Revel.* 2.5. *I will remove thy Candlestick.* *Revel.* 2.16.24. Now we have no warrant in the word

Page 110.

of

of God to thinke that God would remove his Gospell from a Church, because one Angell in that Church hath lost his first love, when all the other, and the whole Church also are fervent and zealous in their love to Christ. Or that God would spue out a whole Church out of his mouth, for the lukewarmenesse of one man, when the Church it selfe and all the other Ministers are zealous. This is the reason that makes us beleeve that though one *Angell* be sometimes spoken unto in particular, yet it must necessarily be understood in a collective sence, not in an individuall sence, which we hinted in our answer. But the Remonstrant comes with his *Index expurgatorius*, and answereth us onely with a *Deleatur*. And thus he serves us also in the following reasons, why Christ did not write *To the Angels* in the plurall number; but *To the Angell* in the singular. And this he doth throughout the whole booke, passing by unanswered those things which are most materiall. *Vas vitreum lambens, pultem non attingens.*

As for that tedious discourse that followeth in foure leaves (about our overliberall concession, that, suppose the word *Angell* be meant *Individually*, yet it made nothing for the upholding of a Diocesan Bishop with sole power of ordination, and jurisdiction, as a distinct order superiour to Presbyters) we will be very briefe in our answer to it, to prevent surfet, and because it is more then we need have yeelded, and also because so little is said of it to the purpose by this Remonstrant. And here let the Reader observe:

1. That of the foure Authors cited in the upholding of the *individuall* Angel, Doctor *Fulke* is falsely alleged,

and the other three, Master *Beza*, Doctor *Raynolds* and *Pareus*, though they interpret the word *Angell* Rev. 1. for one singular person, yet we are sure none of them held Episcopacy by divine right. For D. *Raynolds* his letters to S. *Francis Knowles* now in print will witnesse: and for *Beza* and *Pareus*, it is well knowne that they were *Presbyterians*. We expected many of the ancient Fathers to make good this interpretation; but we see he is beholding to those for it who are none of the least enemies to the *Hierarchall preeminency*, and therefore we may be the more secure that no great prejudice can come to our cause by this interpretation, if taken in the sence of these Authors.

2. That the great question is: what makes this interpretation for a *Diocesan Bishop*, with sole power of *ordination* and *jurisdiction*, as a distinct *order* above *Presbyters*? But the Remonstrant cunningly conceales halfe the question, and answers, *much every way* And why so? *Because if there were many Angels in each Church, and yet but one singled out and called The Angel of that Church, it must needs follow that there was a superiority, and inequality.* But what is this to the question in hand? The thing to be proved is, not onely that this Angell had a *superiority*, but a *superiority of jurisdiction* over his fellow Angels; but of this *altum silentium*. Doctor *Reynolds* will tell you that this was onely a superiority of order; and that all jurisdiction was exercised in common. *Beza* will tell you, that this Angell was onely ὁ πρῶτος, and that he was *Angelus Præses*, not *Angelus Princeps*. And that he was *Præses mutabilis*, and *ambulatorius*, just as a *Moderator* in an *assembly*, or as the *Speaker* in the *House of Commons*, which is onely during the

Page 111.

the Parliament. Both which interpretations may well ſtand with the *ſuperiority* and *inequality* you ſpeake of.

Our firſt argument to prove that though the word *Angel* be taken *individually*, that yet nothing will hence follow to uphold a Dioceſan Biſhop with ſole power of juriſdiction as a diſtinct order Superior to Presbyters was, becauſe it was never yet, nor never will be proved that theſe Angels were Dioceſan Biſhops; conſidering that pariſhes were not ſo numerous as to be divided into Dioceſſes in Saint *Iohns* daies. And the ſeven Starres are ſayd to be fixed in their ſeven Candleſtickes, not one Star over divers Candleſticks. And *Tindall* together with the old tranſlation calls them ſeven congregations. And becauſe we read that at *Epheſus*, that was one of thoſe Candleſtickes, there was but one flock, for the anſwer of all which we expected a learned diſcourſe to prove that the ſeven Churches were Dioceſan, and ſo conſequently the Angels Dioceſan Angels. But the Remonſtrant baulkes his worke as too great for his ſhoulders, and inſtead of ſolid Divinity turnes criticke, and playes upon words and ſyllables *Domitian* like, catching at flies, when he ſhould have beene buſied about greater matters.

Firſt, he tels us, *That if Pariſhes were not united into Dioceſſes* (or were not ſo many as to be divided into Dioceſſes which we thinke all one notwithſtanding your parentheſis) *in Saint Iohns daies, and therefore no Dioceſan Biſhop; by the ſame reaſon we may as well argue, that there were no parochiall Biſhops neither, ſince that then no pariſhes were as yet diſtinguiſhed.* Which we Page 111, 112.

grant

grant to be very true. But if there were no Parochiall Bishops in the Apostles daies, much lesse Diocesan. The Apostolicall Bishops were Bishops of one Church, and not of one parish (as we meane by parish) till many yeeres after. But not to quarrell at the word parish, or diocesse; let but the Remonstrant shewe us that these Angels were Bishops over divers setled Churches, or divers fixed congregations, *& nobis erit alter Apollo.* For our parts we are sure that at first the number of beleevers, even in the greatest Cities, were so few, as that they might well meete ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ in one and the same place; and these were called the Church of the City, and therefore to ordaine Elders κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, & κατὰ πόλιν, are all one in Scripture. - And it cannot be demonstratively proved that they became so numerous in the Apostles daies in any great City, so as that they could not meet in one and the same place. But yet we confesse that it is very probable that it was so in *Ierusalem*, if you compare *Act.* 2.41. 4.4. 5.14. And whether it was so also in these severall *Asian Churches* we know not; but however, this is agreed upon on all parts. That beleevers in great Cities were not divided into set and fixed congregations or parishes till long after the Apostles daies. And that therefore if when they multiplied, they had divers meeting places, that yet notwithstanding these meeting places were frequented promiscuously, and indistinctly, and were taught and governed by all the Presbyters promiscuously and in common, and were all called but one Church, as is evident in *Hierusalem*, *Act.* 8. 1. *Act.* 15. 6. 22. 16. 4. 21. 18.

So also in these seven Churches, where the beleevers

vers of every City are called but one Church, and were governed in common by divers Angels, or Presbyters; as we ſee plainely proved in the Church of *Epheſus*, *Acts* 20. 28. Hence it followeth that there were no ſole-ruling Biſhops, nor one Biſhop over divers Churches, or ſet Congregations in Saint *Iohns* daies.

Secondly, according to his wonted language, he tels us of *making Bulls and Soleciſmes*, becauſe wee ſay *that the ſeven Starres are ſaid to be fixed in their ſeven Candleſtickes*, *whereas theſe Starres are ſaid to be in the right hand of Chriſt*, as if theſe two were ἀσυνεπτα. Know ſir, That in regard of their *protection* they are ſaid to be in Chriſts right hand, but in regard of their *Function* and *Office* they may be truely ſaid to be fixed in their ſeven Candleſtickes. But inſtead of picking quarrels at words, you ſhould have done well (if you could) to prove that theſe Candleſtickes were dioceſan Churches. We ſay each Starre had its Candleſticke, not one Starre over divers. And wee thinke that this Candleſticke was but one particular Church, or one ſet Congregation (though happily when they multiplyed, they might meete indiſtinctly in divers, under divers Angels equally governing) For this we alledged *Obiter Tindals* tranſlating the ſeven Churches ſeven Congregations. All you anſwer is, onely to ſhew that in *other places of the Scripture by Congregation in Tindals ſence cannot be meant a pariſhionall meeting*. But what if it be not ſo in other places, how doe you make it appeare Page 112. Page 113

that it is not ſo in this place? We are ſure it is ſo taken in twenty other places of *Tindals* tranſlation, and may very properly be taken here alſo. We alledge alſo, that in *Epheſus* which was one of theſe Candleſtickes, there was but one flocke. You demand *whether this flocke were Nationall, Provinciall, or Dioceſan?* And why doe you not demand whether it were not *Oecumenicall* alſo? that ſo the Pope may in time come to challenge his flocke *univerſall.* But you are ſure, you ſay, that *this flocke was not a parochiall flocke*, becauſe it cannot be proved, that *all the Elders to whom Paul ſpake, were onely belonging to Epheſus.* But can this Remonſtant prove that there were more Elders or Biſhops then thoſe of *Epheſus?* This is to anſwer *Socratically*, and in anſwering not to anſwer. Howſoever it is not ſo much materiall. You your ſelfe confeſſe that the Elders or Biſhops of *Epheſus* had but one flocke. And if divers Biſhops were over one flocke in the Apoſtles daies, where is your individuall Biſhops over divers flockes in the Apoſtles daies?

Page 114.

Our ſecond argument is alſo drawne from the Church of *Epheſus*, which was one of the ſeven Candleſtickes, in which we are ſure in Saint *Pauls* daies there were many Angels, and thoſe called Biſhops, *Acts* 20. 28. And to one of thoſe in all likelyhood was the Epiſtle to *Epheſus* directed, if the direction be meant individually. But yet wee read not a word of any ſuperiority, or ſuperintendency of one Biſhop over another. To them the

the Church in generall is committed, without any reſpect to *Timothy* who ſtood at his elbow. But to all this *ne γνῦ quidem*, onely he tels us *it is anſwered in anſwering the firſt.* But how true this is, let any Reader judge. At the end of this reaſon, wee produce *Epiphanius* affirming that in ancient time it was peculiar to *Alexandria*, that it had but one Biſhop, whereas other Cities had two. Here our Remonſtrant takes a great deale of paines not to confute us, but to confute *Epiphanius*. All that we will reply is this; to deſire the Reader to conſider that this *Epiphanius* was the firſt that (out of his owne private opinion) accuſed *Ærius* of madneſſe, and (as this Authour ſaith) of hereſie, for denying the ſuperiority of Biſhops over Presbyters. And if this Remonſtrant thinke it no diſparagement to himſelfe to be a confuter of *Epiphanius*, why ſhould we be cryed downe ſo heavily for not agreeing with *Epiphanius* in his judgement concerning *Ærius*? Page 114.

The third argument the Remonſtrant cuts off in the midſt. For whereas wee ſay, that there is nothing ſayd in the ſeven Epiſtles that implyeth any ſuperiority, or majority of rule, or power that thoſe Angels had over the other Angels that were joyned with them in their Churches: the anſwerer makes it runne thus, *That there is nothing ſaid in the ſeven Epiſtles that implies a ſuperiority*; which indeed is to ſpoile the argument. For wee grant there is ſomething ſaid to imply a ſuperiority of the Miniſters over the people, but the queſtion is Page 116.

of a superiority of power of one Angell over the other Angels which were joyned with him in his Church. But this he conceales, because hee knew it was unanswerable. Onely he tels us; First, that the *Epistles are superscribed to the Angell, not Angels.* This is *crambe millies cocta* But what is this to a majority of rule or power? Secondly, he tels us it will appeare from the *matter of the severall Epistles.*

Page 117. For hee askes; *Why should an ordinary Presbyter be taxed for that which hee hath no power to redresse? That the Angell of Pergamus should be blamed for having those which hold the doctrine of Balaam, or the Nicolaitans, when he had no power to proceed against them. Or the Angell of the Church of Thyatira for suffering the woman Iezebel* (if it must be so read) *to teach and seduce when he had no power of publique censure to restraine her?* This discourse is very loose and wild, *Vt nihil pejus dicamus.* Doth not the Remonstrant plead here for sole power of jurisdiction (which hee doth so much disclaime in other places of his booke) when hee would have the singular Angel of *Pergamus* and *Thyatira*, to have power to proceed against offendors, either he doth this or nothing. For our parts we answer without lisping; That it was in the power not of one Angell, but of all the Angels of *Pergamus* and *Thyatira*, to proceed against those that *held the doctrine of Balaam and the Nicolaitans.* To restraine that woman *Iezebel*, or the Bishop of *Thyatira* his wife (if it must needs be so read) wee doe not thinke that one *ordinary Presbyter* (as you call him)

him) was to exercise censures alone, nor one *extraordinary Bishop* neither. We find the contrary *Matth.* 8. 1 *Corinth.* 5. And therefore we referre it to the Minister or Ministers of each Congregation with the advice, and consent of the Presbyters adjoyning which we are sure, is more consonant to the word then to leave it to the Hierarchicall Bishop, and his Chancellor, Commissary, or Officiall.

In the next paragraph, wee challenge you to shew us what kind of superiority this Angell had, if he had any at all? We require you to prove that he had any more then a superiority in parts and abilities, or of order. Where is it said that the Angell was a superiour degree or order of Ministery above Presbyters? Or that he had sole power of ordination and jurisdiction? But you flie from those questions as farre as from a Snake that would sting you, and disdaining all that we say (which is your accustomed way of answering) you tell us that *you are able to shew who were the parties to whom some of these Epistles were directed, and to evince the high degree of their superiority. Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.* Alas sir, you tell us but what we told you before, and what others have ingeminated μυερομυελιως. You say, *That Ignatius and Tertullian tell us that Onesimus was now the Angell or Bishop of Ephesus, and Polycarpus of Smyrna.* But marke what we answer. Page 117. Page 118.

First, we doubt of the truth of the story. For

others tell us that *Timothy* was Bishop (as they call him of *Ephesus* when Christ wrote this Epistle: and this opinion *Ribera*, *Lyra*, and *Pererius* follow. Others leave it in *medio*, and say it is uncertaine. But suppose the story were true, we answer

Secondly, it doth not follow because *Onesimus* was Bishop of *Ephesus* in Saint *Johns* daies, that therefore he was the onely party to whom Christ wrote his Epistle. For Saint *Paul* tels us that there were many Bishops at *Ephesus* besides *Onesimus*, and he may very well write to him, and to all the rest as well as him. That Christ wrote not onely to *Polycarpus* (if hee were Angell of *Smyrna*) but to all the other Angels that were at *Smyrna*, appeares by what we said before out of Revelation 2. 10.

Thirdly, you know sir, that by your owne confession *Bishops and Presbyters* had all one name in the Apostles daies, and long after, even in *Irenæus* his time. And therfore what though *Polycarpus* be called the Bishop of *Smyrna*; and *Onesimus* Bishop of *Ephesus*: still the question remaines, whether they were Bishops *phrasi Apostolica?* (that is Presbyters) or *phrasi Pontificiâ?* Whether Bishops *Antonomasticè* and διακεκριμένως so called, or whether Bishops in a generall sence, as all Presbyters are called Bishops. And suppose they were Bishops properly so called (which we beleeve not) yet still it lies upon you to prove that these were *Hierarchicall Bishops*. That they had such power as our Bishops assume to themselves.

ſelves. That they were a diſtinct order ſuperior to Presbyters. And that they had ſole power of ordination and juriſdiction. We are confident that you are ſo farre from being able to prove that they had a ſole power, as that you cannot prove they had any ſuperiority of power over their fellow Angels. For ought of any thing ſaid by you in this large diſcourſe, *This individuall Angell* may be nothing elſe then a *Moderator of a company of Presbyters*, having onely a ſuperiority of order, and this alſo mutable and changeable, according as *Paræus* and *Beza* hold, whom you follow in this interpretation.

In the ſhutting up of this diſcourſe concerning the *Angels*, the Remonſtrant as if he were very angry, ſpits out nothing but ſcorne and contempt againſt his adverſaries. We bring one example and two teſtimonies to prove that the Angels of the ſeven Churches were not ſuperior one to another, and he cries out as one much diſpleaſed, *Away then with theſe your unproving illuſtrations and unregardable teſtimonies which you as deſtitute of all antiquity ſhut up the Scene withall.* Page 118. But though you fling them away in your anger and fury, yet we truſt the ingenious Reader will gather them up, and conſider alſo that this Remonſtrant (that like another *Champion* againſt Doctor *Whitaker* bragges that all the Fathers, and all the Councels are of his ſide and yet he) brings neither Fathers nor Councels for to prove that theſe Angels are to be underſtood indivi-

vidually: and so wee take our leave of this discourse.

In the next place we come to the *two postscripts* (which indeed were *post-scripta* after the booke was made, and inserted to avoyd an *hiatus*) which all the defenders of Hierarchy cite for the averring of Episcopacy by divine right. To this you reply:

First, *That you are no waies ingaged to defend these postscripts*: It is true, not as you are a Remonstrant, but as you are *juratus in verba Magistri*, sworne to maintaine any thing that may uphold Hierarchicall Episcopacy.

Secondly, you confesse ingeniously *they are not canonicall*; yet you say *they are of great antiquity*; but you durst not set downe how ancient. For wee have good reason and authority to thinke that they are not ancienter then *Theodoret* who lived 435. yeeres after Christ. We brought many arguments to prove not onely the *Apocryphalnes*, but the *falsenesse* of these *subscriptions*. To all which you subscribe by your silence. Onely you would faine (if you could) justifie that clause in the *subscription to Titus written from Nicopolis*; and the rather because you finde it so in that *famous ancient Manuscript of Tecla sent by the late Patriarch of Constantinople*. It seemes then you have seene that Manuscript. And if so, why doe you not deale faithfully with your Reader, and discover what you finde in it; for we are credibly informed in that copy there is no mention of *Titus* his being

Page 121.

being *Biſhop of Creet*, or of *Timothy* his being *Biſhop of Epheſus*. But this is your conſtant courſe, to conceale whatſoever makes againſt you, and to magnifie whatſoever hath but a ſhadow of appearance for you, that all men may perceive you ſeeke victory rather then truth.

But before we leave the *Poſtſcripts* we will anſwer to your two queſtions. Firſt, *you would faine ſee any pretence of ſo much age againſt the matter of theſe ſubſcriptions, the averred Epiſcopacy of Timothy and Titus.* Page 119. For reply, we referre you to what is ſaid before at large in anſwer to this demand. Onely we will put you in minde of a ſpeech of Biſhop *Barlow*: *We are not unwilling to be judged by antiquity, ſo it be ſuch an antiquitie to which Ignatius appeales.* Τὰ ἀρχεῖα ἀψευδῆ ὁ Χριστός. *Nothing more acceptable to us then Hiſtories, if ſuch as are written by him who ſtiles himſelfe, The ancient of daies. And for the Fathers, none more welcome to us then him whom Juſtin Martyr cals Pater Patriæ, and that is Saint Paul.* Now Saint *Paul*, when he wrote his firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, and purpoſely undertooke in his third Chapter to ſet out the Office of a Biſhop, mentioneth nothing in that Office which is not competent to a Presbyter; and therefore omits the Office of a Presbyter, including it in the Office of a Biſhop; which hee would never have done, if hee had at the ſame time made *Timothy* an Hierarchicall Biſhop, with a power to doe that formally which was unlawfull for a Presbyter to doe. And beſides

sides we have proved that this Epistle was written before *Pauls* first being at *Rome*, and so before the time that you say *Paul* made him *Bishop*. As for his Epistle to *Titus*, he directly confounds the Offices of Presbyters and Bishops, and makes them one and the same, Chapter 1. Verses 5, 6, 7. Which he certainely would not have done if he had made them at that time distinct Orders with distinct Offices. The ancient Fathers indeed some of them call *Timothy* and *Titus* Bishops in an improper sense, because they staid longer in *Ephesus* and *Creet* then Evangelists ordinarily did. And did preach, and ordaine, and doe those things which Bishops in their time used to doe, which notwithstanding they did not formally doe as Bishops, but virtually and eminently as Officers of an higher degree. Hence *Salmeron* himselfe saith in his first disputation upon *Timothy*, *Videtur ergo quod fuerit plusquam Episcopus, etiamsi ad tempus in ea civitate ut pastor praedicaverit, & sacros ordines promoverit. Unde quidam vocant eum Episcopum.* *Ambrose* saith one while he was a *Deacon*, another while a *Presbyter*. Others a *Primate*, and others a *Bishop*. *Lyra* proveth him to have beene an *Archbishop*, and *Titus* a *Priest*. *Beda* calleth him an *Apostle*. *Aquinas* thinkes that *Titus* was *Bishop* of *Dalmatia*, because when *Paul* wrote his second Epistle to *Timothy* hee was at *Dalmatia*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. Thus you see the Fathers agree not amongst themselves, and therefore helpe you little in this point.

Your

Your ſecond queſtion is: *Whether ever we have beene urged to ſubſcribe to any other ceremonies then have beene eſtabliſhed by the Lawes of this Realme and Church? And why theſe Ceremonies are the Biſhops more then Ours?* We anſwer: Firſt, That to our knowledge ſome have beene urged to ſubſcribe to other ceremonies then have beene eſtabliſhed by the Lawes of this Realme, and Church, and to promiſe obedience *editis & edendis*. Secondly, that this very urging of us to ſubſcribe to the ceremonies eſtabliſhed, is more then the Lawes require; For the Lawes require to ſubſcription onely to the thirty nine Articles. Thirdly, We cannot but juſtly diſlike your diſtinction of, *The Lawes of this Realme and Church*. For we know no Lawes of the Church obligatory, but ſuch as are eſtabliſhed by the Lawes of the Realme, as both Houſes of Parliament have lately determined. And whereas you aske, *Why theſe Ceremonies are the Biſhops, more then ours?* We anſwer: Firſt, becauſe it is ordinarily ſaid, *No Ceremony, no Biſhop*. But it was never ſaid, *No Ceremony, no Presbyter*. Secondly, becauſe in the Convocation (which you here terme the Church) the Biſhops, or rather the Archbiſhop ſwayes all. And there are five or ſix which are there, *Ex mero Officio*, and for the moſt part are the Biſhops creatures, and hang their ſuffrages upon his lippes: and but two Clerkes for the Presbyters, which alſo for the moſt part are forced upon them by the Biſhop, Page 122.

and his Officers. Thirdly, because they are ours, if ours as a burden. But theirs, as their crowne, and glory, for which they fight as for a second Purgatory, to uphold their Courts and Kitchins.

In the next place we propounded an objection framed by Bishop *Andrewes* and divers others from the inequality in the Ministery appointed by Christ himselfe, betweene the twelve Apostles and the seventy Disciples. To which wee answered: First, that it cannot be proved that the Apostles had any superiority over the seventy, either of ordination, or jurisdiction. Secondly, suppose it could; yet, That superiority and inferiority betweene Officers of different kindes, will not prove that there should be a superiority and inferiority betweene Officers of the same kinde. To which you reply; first, *That the Apostles ordained the Deacons, that Paul laid hands on Timothy.* Page 123. But this is no solution of the objection, unlesse you can prove the Deacons and *Timothy* to have beene amongst the number of the seventy Disciples, or *Paul* to have beene one of the twelve Apostles. Secondly, you answer, That Bishops and Presbyters differ *toto genere*; and are *Officers of different kind, as much as the Apostles and the seventy Disciples.* Page 124. Which is an assertion not onely contrary to the Fathers (who accounted the Bishop to be but *Primus Presbyter*; and as *Hierome* saith, *Unum ex se electum celsiori gradu collocatum.*) *Aquin. Ancol. Caprol. &c.* But also more unsound then most of the Papists who freely acknowledge that *Presbyteratus* is

is the higheſt order in the miniſtry, and that *Epiſcopacy* is but a different degree of the ſame order, and not a ſuperior order from Presbyters. An order may be reputed higher, either becauſe it hath intrinſecally an higher vertue, or becauſe it hath an higher degree of honour and dignity. Now we deny not but the latter antiquity did by their Canons make Epiſcopacy an higher Order in regard of dignity and honour, τάξις or καθόλου μείζων τιμῆς (as a Councell ſpeakes) but did never account it an higher power by divine right. This laſt branch the Remonſtrant would faine prove (if he could) by an argument drawne from ſucceſſion; becauſe (ſaith he) *the Biſhops ſucceed the Apoſtles, and the Presbyters the ſeventy Diſciples.* And we are challenged, page 158. to ſhew *whether ever any Father or Doctor of the Church till this preſent age held that Presbyters were the ſucceſſors to the Apoſtles, and not to the ſeventy Diſciples rather.* But here is nothing in which the Remonſtrant ſhewes more wilfull ignorance then in this. For the ancient Fathers doe make the Presbyters ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles as well as Biſhops. Thus *Irenæus* liber 4. cap. 43, 44. *Quapropter & eis, qui in Eccleſiâ ſunt Presbyteris obedire oportet, his qui ſucceſſionem habent ab Apoſtolis, ſicut oſtendimus qui cum Epiſcopatus ſucceſſione charisma veritatis certum ſecundum placitum patris acceperunt.* So alſo *cap* 44. and *lib.* 3. *cap.* 2. Thus alſo our *Ierome* (as you call him) in his Epiſtle *ad Heliodorum, Clerici dicuntur Apoſtolico*

gradui succeſſiſſe. So *Origen* in *Matth.* 16. ſaith, all Presbyters ſucceeded the Apoſtles in the power of the keyes. And *Ignatius ad Smyrnenſes* ſaith the ſame. Yet *ſtill like* (as you ſay you have heard) page 125.) *ſome beaten cooke, you dare crow, and tell your Reader, that all antiquity hath acknowledged* τρεῖς βαθμοὺς *three ſeverall ranks in the Church Hierarchie.* But where will you begin your antiquity? We ſay with the Father, *id verum quod antiquiſſimum.* Shew us your three degrees in Scripture. You confeſſe page 47. that theſe three orders are not there to be found. We read in Scripture, the *Deacon* to be a ſtep to a *Presbyter*, but not a *Presbyter* to a Biſhop. And wee deny that ever it was accounted in antiquity, that a Biſhop did ever differ from a *Presbyter*, as a *Presbyter* from a *Deacon*. For theſe differ *Genere proximo* (*Noverint Diaconi ſe ad miniſterium, non ad ſacerdotium vocari.*) But a Biſhop differs from a Presbyter as from one who hath that power of Prieſthood no leſſe than himſelfe; and therefore the difference betweene theſe Prieſts be *circumſtantiall*, and not ſo *eſſentiall* as betwixt the other. Thus Biſhops and Archbiſhops are divers orders of Biſhops according to ſome Canons of the Church: not that one excelled the other, as a power of higher vertue, but of higher dignity then the other. Indeed of late yeeres Epiſcopacy hath beene a βαθμὸς to preferment, and a *ladder* for all pious and conſcientious men to be ſuſpended upon, as *Mordecai* upon *Hamans* gallowes; but now is in danger to become

Page 124.

(like

(like *Hamans* ladder) their owne ruine and downe- Page 115.
fall. *Iam ſumus ergo pares.*

In your tranſition to your next Paragraph, that you might diſparage the oppoſers of the Hierarchicall Epiſcopacy by divine right, you endeavour to make them the Diſciples of none but *Jerome*. But herein you cannot but know how injuriouſly you deale with them, conſidering the numberleſſe number of Authors, both ancient and moderne, that affert that, which you would faſten upon him alone. In the Paragraph it ſelfe, you confeſſe what we undertooke to prove; That the ancient Biſhops and others differ in regard of their *Acceſſories*, dignities, titles, and maintenance. But onely whereas among other inſtances we told you of golden Chalices and wooden Prieſts; You tell us, *That if in time we ſhould ſee wooden Chalices, and* Page 127.
wooden Prieſts, we may thanke our ſelves. Truely ſir, we may thanke you, and not our ſelves; for the Lordlineſſe and inſolent carriages of ſome Biſhops under the great revenues and the multitude of *wooden Prieſts* which they have made, who have beene intoxicated with the *Golden Chalice* of the whore of *Babylons* abominations, hath ſo alienated the affections of people from them; as that what doome ſo ever they are ſentenced unto, it is no other then what they have brought upon themſelves. As for our part, we are ſtill of the ſame mind, that honourable maintenance ought to be given to the Miniſters of the Goſpell, not onely to live, but to be hoſpitable. Indeed we inſtanced

in

in many that did abuſe their large revenues. But you are pleaſed to ſay, *That in this Ablative age the fault is rare and hardly inſtanceable.* We thinke the contrary is more hardly inſtanceable. And as for your *Ablative age*, if you meane it of poore *Preſbyters*, who have beene deprived of all their ſubſiſtance by the unmercifulneſſe of Biſhops, whom they with teares have beſought to pitty their wives and children, we yeeld it to be too true. Or if you meane, in regard of the purity of the ordinances, the frequency of preaching, the freedome of conceived prayer; We denie not but in this ſence alſo it may be called the *Ablative age*. But if you relate it to Epiſcopacy and their Cathedrals (with whom it is now the *Accuſative age*) We hope that the yeere of recompenſe is come, and that in due time for all their *Ablations* they may be made a gratefull *oblation*. We have done with this ſection, and feare not to *appeale to the ſame judicious eyes* the Remonſtrant doth, to judge to whoſe part that *Vale* of *abſurd inconſequences and*
Page 128. *bold ignorance* which hee brands us withall doth moſt properly appertaine.

SECT.

SECT. XIV.

IN this Section hee comes to make good his answers formerly given to ſome objections by him propounded, and by us further urged: The firſt objection was from that *prejudice which Epiſcopacy challenging a divine originall doth to Soveraignty*, which was wont to be acknowledged, not onely as the *conſerving* but as *the creating cauſe* of it in former times. The Remonſtrant thinks this objection is ſufficiently removed, by telling us, there *is a compatibleneſſe in this caſe of Gods act and the Kings. And what can wee ſay to this?* Sir, you know what we have ſaid already, and not onely ſaid but proved it; and yet will confidently tell us you have *made good by undeniable proofes, that (beſides the ground which our Saviour layd of this imparity) the bleſſed Apoſtles by inſpiration from God made this difference*, &c. Made good? when? where? by what proofs? Something you have told us about the Apoſtles, but not a word in all the defence of any ground laid by our Saviour of this imparitie; yet the man dreams of undeniable proofs of that whereof he never ſpake word. Remonſt. p. 26. Pag. 129.

Wee muſt therefore tell you againe, take it as you pleaſe, that if the Biſhops diſclaime the influence of Soveraignty into their creation, and ſay that the King

doth not make them Bishops; they must have no being at all. Nor can your questions stop our mouthes:

Pag. 130. *Where or when did the King ever create a Bishop? Name the man and take the cause.* Wee grant you Sir, that so much as there is of a Presbyter in a Bishop, so much is Divine: *But that imparity and jurisdiction exercised out of his own demandated authority*, which are the very formalities of Episcopacie, these had their first derivation from the *Consent*, *Customes*, *Councell*, *Constitution* of the Church, which did first demandate this Episcopall authority to one particular person; afterwards the Pope having obtained a *Monarchie* over *the Church*, did from *himself* demandate that authority that formerly *the Church* did, and since the happy ejection of the Popes tyrannicall usurpations out of these Dominions, *our Princes* being invested with all that *Ecclesiasticall power* which that Tyrant had usurped, that same imparity and authority, which was originally demandated from the Church, successively from the Pope, is now from the King. Looke what influence the Church ever had into the creation of Bishops, the same the Pope had after; and looke what influence the Pope had heretofore, the same our Laws have placed in the King· which is so cleere that the Remonstrant dares not touch, or answer.

There was a Statute made the first of *Edward* the sixth, inabling the King to make Bishops by his Letters patents *Onely*: Hence all the Bishops in King *Edwards* the sixt time were created Bishops by the Kings Letters patents ONELY; in which all parts of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction are granted them in precise words, *præter & ultra jus divinum*, Besides and beyond divine

divine right, to be executed onely, *nomine, vice, & Authoritate noſtri Regis*, in the Kings royall ſtead, name, and Authority, as the patents of ſeverall Biſhops in the Rolls declare.

But beſides *the Kings Letters*, *the Biſhop is ſolemnly ordained by the impoſition of the hands of the Metropolitan, and other of his brethren, & theſe as from God inveſt him in his holy calling. As from God?* Good ſir prove that; prove that the Metropolitan and Biſhops in ſuch impoſition of hands are the inſtruments of God, & not the inſtruments of the King: prove they doe it by Commiſſion received from God, and not by command of the King onely. Produce one warrant from Scripture, one preſident of a Biſhop ſo ordained by a Metropolitan and fellow Biſhops, and without more diſpute take all. Shortly, reſolve us but this one thing; what is it that takes a man out of the ordinary ranke of Presbyters, and advanceth him to an imparity and power of juriſdiction? is it humane authority teſtified in the Letters of the King, or is it divine authority teſtified by the ſignificative action of impoſition of hands by the Metropolitan and fellow Biſhops? if the former, you grant the cauſe, if the latter, conſider with what good warrant you can make a form of Ordination (by the hands of a Metropolitan and fellow Biſhops) which is a meer humane invention, to be not onely a ſigne, but a mean of conveying a peculiar and ſuperiour power from Divine Authority, and of making a Presbyter a Biſhop *Jure divino*. Pag 130.

Finally, Sir, make as much as you can of your *Ordination by a Metropolitan*, ſlight as much as you pleaſe your unworthy compariſon between the King and our

Patrons, yet did the Kings *Conge d'eſlire* give you no more humane right to Epiſcopacie, then the hands of the Metropolitan and fellow Biſhops give you of right Divine, you would be Biſhops by neither. It is not your confident re-inforcing of your compariſon that ſhal call carry it, till you have firſt proved it from Scripture, that God never inſtituted an order of Presbyters or Miniſters in his Church, as wee have proved, God never inſtituted an order of Biſhops. Secondly, that by the Laws of the land as much of the Miniſteriall power over a particular Congregation is in the patron, as there is of Epiſcopall power in the King. Till then (wee beſeech you) let it reſt undetermined whether your ſelf, or we may beſt be ſent to *Simons Cell*. We ſay no more, leſt you ſhould think *we flout your modeſty with an unbeſeeming frumpe*, which whither our anſwer be guilty of, as you here charge us, let the Reader compare the 28 and 29 pages of your Remonſtrance, and our Anſwer to thoſe pages, and determine.

The ſecond objection was from that imputation which this truth caſts upon all Reformed Churches which want this government; this the *Remonſtrant* muſt needs endevour to ſatisfie, *that hee may decline the envie that attends this opinion*. But what needs the Remonſtrant feare this envy? Alaſſe, the *Reformed Churches are but a poore handfull*! *Rumpantur ilia*, need the Remonſtrant care? Yet is it neither his large proteſtation of his honourable eſteeme of thoſe Siſter Churches, nor his ſolicitous cleering himſelfe from the ſcandalous cenſures and diſgracefull termes caſt upon them by others (under whoſe colours he now militates) that will divert this envie, unleſſe he either de-

deſert his opinion, or make a more juſt defence then he hath yet done. The Defence is, *That from the opinion of the Di. right of Epiſc. no ſuch conſequence can be drawn, as that thoſe Churches that want Biſhops are no Churches. Epiſcopacy though reckoned among matters eſſential to the Church, yet is not of the eſſence of a Church, and this is no contradiction neither.* If you would have avoided the contradiction, you ſhould have expreſſed your ſelfe more diſtinctly; knowing that things eſſentiall are of two ſorts; either ſuch as are eſſentiall *conſtitutivè*, or ſuch as are eſſentiall *conſecutivè*. You had done well here, had you declared whether you count Epiſcopacie eſſentiall to a Church *conſtitutive*, or *conſecutivè*; if *conſtitutivè*, then it is neceſſary to the being of a Church, and it muſt follow, where there is no Biſhop, there can be no Church: If eſſentiall onely *conſecutivè*, wee would be glad to learne how thoſe officers which by Divine inſtitution have demandated to them peculiarly *a poner of ordaining all other officers in the Church (without which the Church it ſelfe cannot be conſtituted)* and ſuch a power as that thoſe officers cannot be ordained without their hands, ſhould not bee eſſentiall to the Conſtitution of a Church, or tend *onely to the well being, not to the being of it?* Either you muſt diſclaim your own propoſitions, or owne this inference, and not think to put it off with telling your Reader. It *is enough for our friends to hold diſcipline of the being of a Church, you dare not be ſo zealous.* If heat in an Epiſcopall cauſe may be called *zeale*, you dare be as *zealous* as any man we know. Your friends wee are ſure are as zealous in the cauſe of their *Epiſcopacie* as any of ours have been in the defence of *diſcipline*. Did ever

Pag. 132.

Pag. 133.

any

any of our friends in their zeale rise higher then to frame an oath, whereby to bind all men to maintaine their discipline? You know some of yours have done as much: but them wee know you will leave to their owne defence, as you doe your *learned Bishop of* Pag.134. Norwich, now he is dead. It is work enough for you to defend your selfe, and give satisfaction to the questions propounded.

First, we demanded the reason why Popish Priests converted to our Religion are admitted without new ordination, when some of our brethren flying in Queen *Maries* time, and having received Ordination in the Reformed Churches were urged at their return to receive it again from our Bishops? This shameless and partiall practice of our Prelats hee could not deny, but frames two such answers of which the second confutes the first, and neither second nor first justifies their practice. In the first he denies a capability of admittance by our laws, and yet in his second, he confesseth many to be admitted without any legall exception, which how well they consist, let the Reader judge.

The second question was, *whether that office which by divine Right hath sole power of Ordination, and ruling of all other officers in the Church, belong not to the being, but onely to the glory and perfection of a Church?* The Remonstrant is so angry at this question, that before hee can finde leisure to answer it, he must needs give a little vent to his chollet: *Can we tell what these men would have?* (saith he) *have they a mind to go beyond us in asserting that necessity and essentiall use of Episcopacie, which we dare not avow?* What is that which you dare not avow? is it that Episcopacy

piſcopacy hath *ſole power of ordaining and ruling all other Officers in the Church?* But this wee are ſure you will avow, That impoſition of hands *in ordination and confirmation have ever been held ſo intrinſecall to Epiſcopacie, that I would faine ſee where it can be ſhewed that* ANY EXTREMITY OF NECESSITY *was by the Catholike Church of Chriſt ever yet acknowledged for a warrant ſufficient to diffuſe them into other hands.* Is not this to ſay that the ſole power of ordaining Officers is in the hands of the Biſhop? *And dare not* WE *avow this now?* Bleſſed be they that have taken downe your confidence. And where you are witty by the way, *you tell us we ſtill talke of ſole Ordination and ſole Juriſdiction, we may if we pleaſe keep that paire of ſoles for our next ſhooes.* Good Sir, wee thanke you for your liberality, but wee doubt you either part with them out of fear you ſhall no longer keep them, or they will prove no longer worth the keeping. But conſider one thing, we beſeech you, if you make this dõnation not onely in your own name, but in the name of the whole Epiſcopall order, you and they may turn *Fratres Mendicantes*, and go bare foot, if you part with theſe paire of ſoles, and what will become of your *Quid facit Epiſcopus, quod non facit Presbyter exceptâ ordinatione?* *You doe not contend* (ſay you) *for ſuch a height of propriety*, &c. that *in what caſe ſoever of extremity and irreſiſtable neceſſity, this ſhould be done onely by Epiſcopall hands.* You do not? It is well you doe not, but did you never meane to affirme it none of you? Conſider (we beſeech) that forecited place *Epiſcopacie Divine Right, part. 2. pag. 91.* weigh the words and then ſpeake, and tell the Authour your judgement.

Epiſc. div. Right part. 2. p. 91.

Pag. 135.

Our

Our third question was, *There being in this* mans thoughts the same *jus divinum* for Bishops that there is for Pastors and Elders, whether if those reformed Churches wanted Pastors & Elders too, they should want nothing of the essence of a Church, but onely of the glory and perfection of it? *The answer* (saith he) *is ready*, which is indeed no answer, it is in sum but this, that it *would be better with them if they had Bishops too*. But how it would be if they wanted Bishops and Pastors and Elders too, of that he saith nothing.

The Remonstrant had presumed to know so much of the mind of the Reformed Churches as to averre, that if they might have their option, they would gladly imbrace Episcopall government; *a foule imputation saith the* Remonstrant: we say so too; a foul imputation to charge the Reformed Churches of a secret inclination to Apostatize from their owne confessions, which doe not onely *maintain a justifiablenesse of their present government, but a necessity of it as the only government appointed by GOD in his Church*, as wee shewed in five Corollaries drawn out of those confessions, which the *Remonstrant* slides over, wherein they doe not onely defend the condition they are in, but tell us by consequence they would not change it for any other forme in the World: Because they tell us *Theirs is the form God hath set down in his Word*, the forme *Christ hath appointed in his Church*, the forme by *which the Church ought to be governed*. Can we think the Churches that thus professe and believe, can ever look for a better form? Or would accept another though propounded to them as better, when they professe this is that form by which they ought to be governed?

Pag. 136.

The testimonies of particular Divines must not be put in the ballance against the confessions of whole Chur-

Churches. God forbid, that all that hath flowed from the pens of Divines of great Learning and place in *England* ſhould paſſe for the Doctrine of the Engliſh Church abroad. Wee will beleeve you it is poſſible *many eminent Divines of the Churches abroad have wiſhed themſelves in your condition, that is in Epiſcopall Government*, not in our condition under Epiſcopall Government. And as eaſily we believe, *they have magnified our Church as the moſt famous exemplary glorious Church in the whole Chriſtian World.* It better a great deale becomes them then *Laodicean* like to ſay (as you ſay, *pag.26.*) their *own is the moſt glorious and exemplary Church, the reſt are but a poore handfull*, and reaſon they ſhould conforme to it, not it to them. But whether it be the beautie, perfection, and glory of Epiſcopall government, or the powerfull and lively preaching of the Word, the powerfull and lively practice of piety, which through the ſpeciall grace of God are found in this Church (then which there hath been nothing more hated or perſecuted under Epiſco. government) that hath made them magnifie the Church of *England*, there is the queſtion, which is not hard to determine. Pag. 137.

To induce the Reader to believe the Reformed Churches would change theirs for our government, the *Remonſtrant* hath told us that there is little difference betweene their government and ours, ſave in perpetuitie of moderatorſhip and excluſion of Lay-elders. This ſaith the *Remonſtrant*, *You ſay is a paſſage of admirable abſurdity.* Sir, wee ſaid admirable; the abſurdity is your own. To mend it, *you would perſwade your ſelfe to feare, wee know not what you ſpeak of: You ſpeake not onely of the next* Churches *of* France *and the* Netherlands. Sir, you ſpake if we re-

member of the Neighbour Churches, and wee conceive, between our Neighbour Churches, & the next Churches of *France* and the *Netherlands*, there is not much distance; sure any common understanding, by Neighbour Churches, would a great deal sooner understand the next Churches of *France*, and the *Netherlands*, then the Churches of *Germany*, *Weteraw*, *Anhault*, &c. Especially considering your instance in those Churches, from whose Moderators our Bishops differ onely in perpetuitie of Moderatorship: Which perpetuitie the *Lutheran* Superintendents have as well as our Bishops. This made us instance in the *Geneva* forme, as knowing no Churches whose πρεσβεία is not fixed, but such as follow their patterne, between which πρεσβεία and our episcopacie wee shewed a sixfold difference: all which the *Remonstrant* wisely passeth; that hee may not be forced to acknowledge the difference greater then hee pretended. Onely tels us with what authority Master *Calvin* and the *deputati Synodi carried the affairs of the Church*; which if the personall worth of the one or the other did procure, what is that to carrying all the affairs of the Church *ex officio*, by vertue of their own peculiarly demandated authority, as our Bishops do, and challenge right to doe?

And even in these Churches of *Germany*, the Superintendents are nothing like our bishops. They are of the same degree with other Ministers, they are onely Presidents while the Synod lasteth; when it is dissolved, their prerogative ceaseth: They have no prerogative over their fellow Ministers, They are subject to their Presbyteries. The Synod ended, they returne to the care of their particular Churches. *Zepper. lib. 2 cap. 10.*

You put us in minde, that you said the difference between them was little, and we need not put you in minde of what our answer was, *Manet altâ mente repostum*: nor do we intend to change. You tell us *our note*

is

is the note of Babylon, *down with it, downe with it.* Yet as long as neither we are *Edomits*, nor ſpeak of *Sion*, but of *Sions* enemies, the note is not Babyloniſh. As *Babylon* had her time to cry againſt *Sion*, downe with it, down with it even to the ground, ſo the time is comming when *Sion* ſhall ſhout with as ſtrong a cry againſt her enemies, and the God of Heaven, whoſe promiſe is to *ariſe for the ſighing of the poore*, we doubt not will vindicate his Church from thoſe proud adverſaries that have ſo long time tyrannized over her, and Judge betweene the Sheep and the Goats. Even hee Judge, whether wee that plead the truth againſt Biſhops, or the Biſhops whoſe cauſe the *Remonſtrant* pleads, have by violent and ſubtill Machinations moſt diſturbed *Sions* peace, and advanced *Babylons* power. *Ezek.* 34.16, 17, 18

SECT. XV.

THe Remonſtrant *had ſaid that Lay Presbytery never had footing in the Chriſtian Church untill this age.* Wherein, ſaid we, hee concludes ſo fully with Doctor *Hals* irrefragrable propoſitions, as if he had conſpired to ſwear to what the Biſhop had ſaid. The Remonſtrant, that it ſeems knows both better then wee, will phraſe it thus; *how like the man looks to* Doctor *Hall*: And anſwers, *As like him as wee are like* Pag. 140.

our ſelves, inſolent and ſcornfull. Truly Sir, wee could ſcarce conceive this likeneſſe by the *Remonſtrance*, and we can leſſe conceive it by this defence. For beſides the flat contradictions which this Defence gives to Epiſcopacie by Divine Right (for which wee doubt the Doctor will give the *Remonſtrant* little thanks) the very language of the Defence inclines to the contrary. For though we acknowledge the Defence, for the ſubſtance of it wholly, and for the phraſe of it in a great part, borrowed from epiſcopacie by Divine Right, yet the extream diſdainfulneſſe that breaths in every page and line pleads with us, to thinke that it is not his, eſpecially if he have made that *vow* of leaving his inſolent and ſcornfull language, which an ancient acquaintance of his hath put the world in hope hee would. Your *Errata* bids us *pag.* 33. Read *Invectives*, truly we may read in every page Invectives: and if to be ſcornfull and inſolent be to be unlike Doctor *Hall*, you have done the Doctor exceeding wrong to ſay the Remonſtrant looks like him.

But be the Remonſtrant who hee will, we hope hee will not take it ill, if comming into publique nameleſs, he receive *par pari*, remembring eſpecially the ſaying of *Hierom* concerning *Domitius* a Senator to his ſcornfull Conſull, *ſi non vis me habere ut Senatorem, cur ego te habeam ut Conſulem?* Why ſhould wee uſe him as a Father, that doth not uſe us as Brethren? Make ſport with our poore wit, triumph over it. It is truth, not wit wee contend for; yet *Ridentem dicere verum quis vetat.*

Pag. 140. You might *have done as wiſely to omit the flouriſh of your wit in ſcorne of ours*; as you ſay *wee did to omit thoſe three*

three knowne texts which we omitted, becauſe the queſtion betweene us was not whether ruling Elders are an ordinance of God and founded in the word or no, But whether ever they had exiſtence in the Chriſtian Church before this preſent age. For the determining of this queſtion, (being *de facto*, not *de jure*) it is more proper to produce the practice of the Churches then texts of Scripture; this doth not pleaſe him. *Al patrons of Layelderſhip before us would not, after the rakings of all the channells of time, have forborne the utmoſt urging of thoſe Teſtimonies, if they had not knowne them ſo far from being convictive that they are unprooving.* Is this the man whoſe chief plea for his divine right is the monument of ſucceeding ages and Teſtimony of Antiquity, and will he now vouchſafe the ſearch after the footſteps of antiquity, no better name *Then the raking of the Channell of time?* had we ſpoken ſo much in the vilification of Antiquity it would have beene accounted hatefull and intolerable inſolencie in us. Pag. 141. Pag. 141.

But *our evidences are not proving and convictive.* Let us put them to the tryall. Our teſtimony from *Origen cannot* (you ſay) *but ſhame us if yet we can bluſh*; belike you remember you have ſo often without juſt cauſe put us to the bluſh, you beginne to feare the colour is ſpent; you charge us with willing concealing the Chap. on purpoſe that we might not be diſcovered.

Were this a fault and worthy of blame, yet little reaſon hath the Remonſtrant to quarrell with us, it is but this one place in which the Remonſtrant chargeth us, wee are punctuall in our other quotations. How many quotations are there in this defence in which the Remonſtrance hath not cited ſo much as the Book, onely thinks it enough to name the Authour?

But

But here we are not so culpable as the Remonstrant makes us. The translation of *Origen* which we followed did not distinguish the booke into Chapters, No more then the Originall doth, Nor other translations with which we have consulted; Nor are wee yet so happy as to meete with that edition where the Chapters are distinguished: so here is no just cause of suspicion either of fraud or feare.

For the text it selfe, whether your collection or ours be most according to the sence of the Authour, let the learned reader judge from the text it selfe, which wee heere set downe translated faithfully according to the Originall.

Videamus an non Christiani magis & melius istis populum ad bonam frugem excitent, nam Philosophi quidem, qui in publico disputant, discrimen auditorum adhibent nullum, sed quisquis volet, adstet licet, atq; audiat. Christiani vero, quoad possunt, eorum, qui ipsos audire cupiunt, animos prius explorantes, eosdemque privatim erudientes, cum videbuntur illi qui auditores sunt futuri, priusquam in publicum proceßerint, usque eò profeciße satis, ut velint benè vivere, tum demum eos introducunt, sive admittunt, separatim quendem ordinem constituentes eorum qui initiati recens, introductique sunt, signumque expiationis nondum acceperunt: alter autem ordo est eorum qui pro virili studium suum repræsentant, non aliud velle se, quam quæ Christianis recta videntur. Apud quos

vel

(vel ſupra quos) ſunt quidam conſtituti, qui in vitam & mores advenientium inquirant, ut qui flagitioſa perpetrant, illos à communi eorum cœtu prohibeant, qui verò iſtiuſmodi non ſunt, eos ex animo amplexantes, indies reddant meliores. Cujuſmodi quoque inſtitutum habent in eos qui peccant, maximèque ſi protervè ſe gerant, quos à ſuo cœtu ejiciunt illi, qui Celſo judice, ſimiles ſunt iis qui inhoneſtiſſimas quaſque res in foro oſtentant. Et Pythagoreorum quidem ſchola illa graviſſima, illis qui ab ipſorum philoſophia deſciverant ſepulchra inania conficiebat, eoſque perinde æſtimans ac ſi demortui planè eſſent. Hi autem quaſi pereuntes & mortuos Deo, qui petulantiæ aut gravi cuipiam facinori obſtringendos ſe tradiderunt, tanquam mortuos lugent, & tanquam è mortuis excitatos, ſi non ſpernendam modo oſtenderint reſipiscentiam, longiori temporis ſpatio, quàm qui primo introducti ſunt, tandem recipiunt, neque ad ullum gubernandi munus in Eccleſiâ Dei quæ dicitur, eligimus eum qui priùs fuerit lapſus, poſtquam ad verbum acceſſerit, &c.

The ſence of this place, ſaith the *Remonſtrant*, is this, *That thoſe which were newly admitted into the Church, who by reaſon of their late acquaintance with ſuch as were left behind them in Pagan ſuperſtition, might be fit Monitors to know and notifie the condition of ſuch Candidates as did offer to come into the Church, were deſigned to that office of* Monitorſhip. Pag. 142. 143.

Here

Here we desired the Reader to consider: first that the scope of the place is to vindicate the Christian assemblies from the imputations unjustly cast upon them by *Celsus*, as if they were a confluence of base and worthlesse people. To cleer this, hee divides all Christians into two Orders: the first were *Catechumeni*, or beginners; and first he shews the care they took about them, before they were baptized. The other order comprehends all such as were baptized, whom he describes in these words. *There is another order of such who according to their ability expresse their endevours to desire nothing but what seems right to Christians*, which two orders are in antiquity distinguished in *Catechumenos & Fideles*. Now that this same *alter ordo* might be kept to live acording to there profession; εἰ σὶ τινὲς τεταγμένοι, there were some *designed* or *constituted*, who should look to the manners of all such as *come to them*; (that is to their meetings) that they that lived wickedly might be banished their assemblies, and heartily embracing such as lived well, they might make them better.

Austin. Serm. 14 de verb. Apost.

Those persons here spoken of, the Remonstrant grants to be *lay persons* (as we terme them) and doth not so much as once goe about to affirme them Presbyters. Onely the question is, who those so constituted were? He saith *Novices newly added to the Church*. Secondly of whome they had the inspection? hee saith *onely of such as were comming out of paganisme and offered themselves to be added to their Assemblies*. Thirdly, what their power was? hee saith, *onely to notifie the lives of such: to be as it were Monitores*, and no more.

For the two first, we conceive it impossible for him to shew in all antiquity that ever the Church did appoint Novices over Novices to be overseers of their manners, and

and much more impoſſible to collect it from this place, ſince *Origen* ſpeaks indefinitely of any of this order (to wit of *Fideles*) and punctually of ſuch who had attained ſuch a meaſure of grace as they were able to expreſſe endevours to do that which is right, and were fit and able by their acquaintance to better others, and therefore theſe could not be Novices. For the ſecond, to wit, over whom they had power? they were not onely ſuch as were lately admitted: for *Origen* ſpeakes generally of all wicked or ſcandalous livers among them, who were to be inhibited their aſſemblies. For the third, the power they had, (which ſaith hee *was onely to be Monitors*) it appeares from the text, that they had power either to keepe back from their aſſemblies, or to receive into their aſſemblies, according as the lives of men were good or bad, and were of that ability, as that they could better them daily with their good counſell. And if any were froward or contumacious, what courſe was further to be taken with them the following words declare; and although it is true, the acts of caſting ſuch out of the Church is attributed primarily to the teachers; yet who dare exclude thoſe former τεταγμένοι from all intereſt in this act? when *Origen* himſelfe ſaith, ἔτι δ' ἐστὶν ἀυτῶν ἀγωγὴ καὶ σὺν ἀμαρτανόντων καὶ ὑλίσκα τῶν ἀκολαστηρίων, &c. the like cuſtome they have about offenders, and chiefely ſuch as are incorrigible. Pag. 142. 143.

But this great Corrector of Tranſlations cannot let us paſſe here without a caſtigation, for tranſlating τεταγμένοι *Præpoſiti ſunt. Vnfaithfully, deceitfully ſaith he.* Sir it would have become you to ſpare your cenſure till you conſidered better; if you had but looked in your Lexicon you might have found that τάττομαι ſignifies

not onely *constituor*, but *præficior*, and betweene *Præfecti* and *prævisits* certainly there is no such great difference as might deserve the censure of *unfaithfulnesse* for using the one instead of the other; besides *Turrianus* translated it thus before us, who, we perswade our selves, was as able to understand the language of *Origen* as our Criticall Remonstrant, if wee may judge of him as hee here discovers himselfe; would any man so confidently charge
Pag. 142. *unfaithfulnesse* upon the translation of others, and himselfe go & translate καὶ ἰδίαν αὐτοῖς περιπαιδεῖς, *They do privatly examine such as are bewitched with Paganisme*: it is true περιπαίδω signifies *incanto* as well as *frequenter admoneo*, to inchaunt as well as to instruct or admonish, but heer it must of necessity be rendred in the latter signification, because it is here the participle of the active voice, and the case agrees not with αὐτοῖς, but with χειρανοὶ; wch is put in the beginning of that clause: so again τὰς δὲ ὡς τοιαῦτας ὅλην ψυχὴν ἀποδεχόμενοι he translates, *the rest that are like themselves they may gladly Receive*, whereas it should be thus, *but receiving those that are not such* (that is) as those wicked persons last spoke of.

These are poore Grammar peccadillio's not worth the taking notice of, but that our Remonstrant is so busie with his *Ferula*, that no sooner can he thinke we trip, but he is presently upon us, *Corrigit Magnus sicat.*

The rest of our testimonies produced in this cause, hee thus answers, First, *he could double our files, and produce many more.* But secondly, *in sad terms, we do nothing*
Pag 143. Pag 144. *herein, but abuse our Reader: For all the places are nothing at all to the purpose in hand.* For the first, *The numbers he could adde to our forces*, are no more then *our own*, except one onely place out of *Gregory Turonensis*: all the rest were urged by us, Even *that* which he saith *is more*

preg-

pregnant then any we have brought. Did ever poore man *make ſo great a brag of nothing?* Truly, Sir, you have much enriched us by paying us with our owne coine. Onely here wee are beholding to you for your teſtimony of the pregnancie of ſome of them, when as you ſaid before, *All of them were nothing to the purpoſe in hand*: it ſeemes your ſecond thoughts correct your former. For his ſecond anſwer, *hee tels us, all theſe places are nothing to the purpoſe.* And why? becauſe *thoſe Seniors, are Civill Magiſtrates*, ſuch as *wee call Aldermen, whoſe advice and aſſiſtance was uſed in all great occaſions of the Church.* To prove this he brings the *African* Canons, *Can.* 100. where οἱ γερόντες are mentioned, and expounds it by the 91 Canon of the *African*, which he cals a Commentary upon this point, *Debere unumquemq; noſtrum in civitate ſua cõvenire Donatiſtarum Præpoſitos, aut adjungere ſibi vicinum collegam, ut pariter* Pag. 145 *eos in ſingulis qnibuſque civitatibus per Magiſtratus vel Seniores locorum conveniant.*

To which we anſwer, That this his Commentary corrupts the text; For in this 91 Canon there is no mention of οἱ γερόντες, The words are διὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων, ἢ τῶν πρώτων φερόντων ἐν τοῖς ἀυλοῖς τόποις. *By the Magiſtrate, or thoſe that are of chief authority in thoſe places*: theſe wee grant were as it were our *Aldermen*, men of civill power and authority, but they were not as *thoſe Elders* mentioned in the 100 Canon. And why ſhould the *Remonſtrant* chooſe rather to follow *Juſtellus*, in reading τῶν πρώτων φερόντων *Seniores locorum*, then *Balſamon*, and *Zonaras*, who read it, *Qui primus ferant*, unleſſe it were to deceive his credulous Reader, and induce him to thinke there were no other Elders in the

Church, then such as were Civill Magistrates; whereas his own *Justellus* in his exposition of the 100 Canon saith, *Erant Seniores, Laici, extra Ecclesiam, de quibus supra ad Can.* 91. *Erant & Seniores Ecclesiastici*; There were Lay-elders out of the Church, of whom wee spake, *Can.*91, and there are Ecclesiastick or Church-elders: To prove which hee brings forth the very testimonies which wee produced from *Baronius*, and others. And certainly, he that compares the two Canons quoted by the *Remonstrant*, will see how absurdly the ἄρχοντες, ἢ πρῶτα τεθέντες in the one Canon are drawn to expound the οἱ γερόντες in the other. For the former were the Magistrates, who having a coercive power, might compell the *Donatists* to meet for conference and disputations, if they did refuse it: The other were not *Magistrates* but *Seniores*, sent by the Church to accuse their Bishop. Now how well is the one expounded by the other?

But if the *Seniors* were not *Aldermen*, yet they were (say you) but as our *Churchwardens* and *Vestry-men, onely trusted with the Vtensils, Stocks, and outward affaires of the Church; businesse of seats and rates, &c.* This the *Remonstrant will, if you will believe him, evince out of our owne testimonies*, and yet meddles not with that, which is the most pregnant testimony to prove that the power of these elders did reach to things of a higher nature *then seats and rates*, and that is the Letter of *Purpurius*, which gives to the *Seniors a concurrent power with the Clergie, to enquire about the dissentions which troubled the Church, that by their wisdome and care peace might be setled in the same.* These dissentions were not about seats or rates, but a contention betweene *Silvanus* the Bishop,

Pag. 146.

and

and *Nundinarius* the Deacon, in a matter of a high nature, too high for our *Church Wardens*, or *Veſtry men* to meddle in; The Biſhop being accuſed, that hee was *Traditor & fur rerum pauperum.* Did ever Churchwardens, or Veſtry men among us, heare, inquire, judge, compoſe ſuch differences as theſe are? *What ſhould* John *a* Nokes, *and* John *a* Stiles, *and* Smug *the* Smith, *meddle with a buſineſſe of Biſhops?* ſaith *Epiſcopacie by Divine Right, part.3.pag.32.* But how doth hee prove they were but as our Churchwardens, or Veſtrymen? *Firſt, becauſe Deacons are named before theſe Seniors where ever they are mentioned.* Secondly, *becauſe* Optatus *reckoning up* quatuor genera capitum, *mentions not Elders.*

Geſt Purgationis Cæcilian. & Felicis.

To anſwer your margine in a margine: why may not *Presbyteri* be as truly tranſlated Elders as Seniors? Pag.147.

For the firſt, though the order of reckoning them be not ſo much to be inſiſted upon, yet wee can tell you (if here your *confidence* had not beene greater then your *conſideration*) that you might have obſerved, that in ſome places they are mentioned not onely before Deacons, but the whole cleargie; For ſo *Gregories* letter cited by us; *Tabellarium cum conſenſu Seniorum, & Cleri memineris ordinandum:* Are not Seniors here mentioned before the cleargie?

His ſecond proofe, that theſe Elders *were no better then meere Churchwardens* and *Veſtry men* was, becauſe Optatus *mentioning foure ſorts of men in the Church mentions not theſe Elders.* But is this the man that hath with ſuch height of ſcorne vilified poore negative arguments, though drawn from ſacred Scripture? And will he now lay ſuch weight upon a negative argument? Surely, if all the truth and practice of the primitive times were bound up in one *Optatus*, (as all Divine

vine truth is lodged in the sacred Volume of the Scriptures) the Remonstrant might have made much of his negative argument, yet hee scornes to heare us reasoning, that because we do not read that the holy Ghost did by the Apostles appoint Bishops, *in remedium Schismatis*, therefore we cannot believe Bishops are of Divine or Apostolicall institution, but of humane. *Away* (saith he) *with this poore negative argument.* And because the Apostle, *Ephesians* the fourth, reckoning the Officers whom Christ hath given and gifted for the edification of his Church, reckons up onely Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, & Teachers, if wee should conclude, *Ergo*, there were no Bishops, The *Remonstrant* would cry out again, *Away with these negative arguments*, yet such an argument frō Scripture may be *valid*, though from no other authority. As for *Optatus*, First, though in these places he mentions not Elders, yet that other place which wee brought out of the same Author doth, which the learned Antiquary *Albaspinæus* (though a Papist) with us acknowledgeth.

Secondly, these places produced by the *Remonstrant* crosse one another as much as they crosse us, for *Ministri* are left out in one as well as *Seniores* in both. Thirdly, these *Seniores* are included *in turba fidelium*, as the Apostle, *Rom.*10.14. comprehends all the Church under these two, *hearers and teachers*, and so again, *Heb.*13.24. *Rulers and Saints.*

Yet the Remonstrant is resolved to hold the conclusion. *Elders in a ranke above Deacons in a setled power of government* with the Pastors, shall be damned by him

Pag. 147.

him for a *new and unjuſtifiable opinion*. Yet this is the man that would by no meanes be thought to condemne the Reformed Churches, Though hee fall as unhappily neere the very words of their profeſt enemies, the *Netherland* Remonſtants, as ever we did the words of *Aerius*. *Quod attinet Praxin antiquitatis ex eâ videlicet id demonſtrari poſſe idoneis argumentis* (*ut Cenſor aſſerit*) *audaciæ & temeritatis eſt*: and again, *Tota antiquitatis Praxis ei repugnat*: but oh that our Remonſtrant would once learn to take the counſell he gives! And he that adviſeth *us to give glory to God in yielding to undoubted and cleere truth*, would do ſo himſelfe! For if it be not more cleere, that *there were elders anciently in the Church*, then that there were *none*, and that *theſe elders* were not *civill Aldermen*, *but eccleſiaſticall Officers*, Not *meere Churchwardens and Veſtry men* buſied about *inferiour things of ſeats and rates*, but employed in *matters of higher nature*, let the Remonſtrant *never renounce epiſcopacy*. But if it be, let him *take heed he do not renounce his word*, which he utters, *pag.* 147. *I doe here ſolemnely profeſſe that if any one ſuch inſtance can be brought, I will renounce epiſcopacy for ever.*

SECT.

SECT. XVI. XVII. XVIII.

Pag. 148. THE *reſt* of our Anſwer (you ſay) is but a *meere declamation*. And good Sir, what was your whole Remonſtrance but a *declamation*? And what is your *Defence* but a Satyre? But ours is worthy of no other anſwer then *contempt and ſilence*. You are very dextrous and happy in thoſe kind of Anſwers, your whole Defence is full of them. It is true you ſay, *The religious Biſhops of all times have ſtrongly upheld the truth of God againſt Satan, and againſt his Antichriſt*. And it is as true that we told you, that others have upheld the truth as ſtrongly as Biſhops ever did; Yea, & at ſometimes when there was never a Biſhop in the world to appeare for the truth. And therefore never impropriate all the glory to Epiſcopacie. It is alſo true that wee told you, that ſome irreligious Biſhops have upheld Satan and his Antichriſt againſt the truth of God, and what can you ſay to this? *What is this to their calling*? Sir, their upholding Antichriſt makes as much againſt their calling, as their upholding the truth makes for their calling. If you fetch an argument from the one for their calling, we may as Logically fetch an argument from the other againſt their calling with as much concluding ſtrength; but *you can tell us of Presbyters wicked and irreligious, ſhall the functi-*

on.

on it ſelf therefore ſuffer? Like enough. And we could tell you that they *find more countenance from Biſhops then the painfulleſt Miniſters.* But if Presbyters ſhould be as generally corrupted as Biſhops now are, have as much ſtrength to ſuppreſſe the Goſpell, and promote Popery, as the Biſhops by their ſupreame power have, if they can bring no more evidence of Divine inſtitution then Biſhops can, and are of no more neceſſity to the Church then Biſhops are, let the Function ſuffer.

We told you what an unpreaching Biſhop ſaid of a preaching Biſhop; *this ſay you is our ſlander* not *their juſt Epithite*, and challenge us to *ſhew any unpreaching Biſhop in the Church of* England *this day.* Sir, pardon us if we tell you that you put us in minde of *a poore Sir John* that becauſe he had made one Sermon in 40. yeeres would needs be counted a preaching miniſter: if you ſpeake of preaching after that rate, then indeed you may call all the Biſhops in *England* preaching Biſhops. But the people of *England* can ſo well tell who deſerves the name of a preaching Biſhop, that it is not the preaching of a Sermon once a yeere, or a quarter, or a month, that will bee ſufficient to merit and maintain that name. Some indeed have taken ſome paines heretofore; But there are ſo few of them now, that ſure the Remonſtrant intended this booke for poſterity: The preſent Age will never beleeve that *England* is ſo full of preaching Biſhops, that there is not an unpreaching Biſhop to bee found. But what if we ſhould challenge the Remonſtrant to *ſhew any* preaching Biſhop in *England*, ſuch a preaching Biſhop as *Chryſoſtome*, *Auguſtine*, and the reſt of thoſe ancient worthies

were who if they had preached no oftner then our Bishops, *Chrysostome* had never mentioned his χθὲς so often, nor his *Nudiustertius*, Nor his *eras* and *perendiè*, Nor *Austin* his *Nudius tertiani & hesterni Sermones*, Nor *Cyprian* his *Quotidiani Tractatus*.

Indeed of old, one saith, *Bishops gloried of their chaire, and teaching, as the flowre of their garland; preferring it far before government; but when they were faln from spirituall felicity, and infected with Secular smoake, then they commended the labour of teaching to Presbyters, when the Jurisdiction and Consistory did carry all the credit; Every Office in the Church being counted a dignity as it had more or lesse jurisdiction annexed to it*, & this dignity hath almost crowded out the duty.

Pag. 149. *The scandall of inferiour Ministers* hee professeth *to bleed for*, but saith, *we blazon*: No Sir, as we told you before, and tell you again, *they* have beene *the trumpets of their own shame*, that like *Hophne* and *Phineas* made the sacrifices of the Lord to be abhorred. But wee beseech you, what is the English of your desires *to have had the faults made lesse publike?* Doe you mean you would not have had them medled withall in open Parliament? or that you would have had the Parliament doe by all Petitions brought in against such scandalous persons, as *Constantine* did by those Papers that the proud contentious Bishops gave one against another, commit them to the fire? if so, then as you are Christian tels us, whether you doe not think this had been the onely way to involve the whole Parliament, and Nation in the guilt of those sins; and expose them to that wrath and vengeance that would from heaven pursue them?

Be-

Bethink your ſelf how you will anſwer this at that great Tribunall *to which* you make ſo many raſh and bold appeals, as alſo your prophaning the glorious title of the God of peace, that you might under the ſweet name of peace perſwade an impunity for ſin. Sir, we nothing feare but wee ſhall anſwer our oppoſing the *unerring rule* of the Word of God (which texts you never went about to anſwer) againſt that example of *Conſtantine* (who as a man, though good, was ſubject to errour) ten thouſand times better then you will doe either of theſe.

In our next Section, ſaith our Remonſtrant, *we ſpit in the face of our Mother.* Good Reader pleaſe to review our Anſwer, Section 17. and judge. The Remonſtrant will deny preſently, that hee and the Biſhops are the Church of *England*, and yet here, that which is ſpoken againſt them and their *Perſeus*-like practices is ſpoken againſt *our Mother the Church.* Well, be what you pleaſe, *Fathers*, and *Mothers, and Sonnes, and all.* Pag. 149.

Onely we deſire the *Remonſtrant* if hee can, to tell us what the *Church of England* is. For it doth not pleaſe him here that we ſhould call the *Convocation the Church of England*, much leſſe the *Biſhops*, or *Archbiſhops*. Yet if we be not miſtaken, you your ſelf call the Convocation the Church of *England*, *pag.* 122. And the Canons and Conſtitutions made in the Convocation are called the Canons and Conſtitutions of *the Church of England*, which the Convocation alone excluding the Parliament cannot be ſo much as a repreſentative of, unleſſe you will count the *whole Laity of the Nation* repreſented in Parliament none of the Church of *England*. Yet this is the *Church* ſo cryed Pag. 149.

In the late Canons the Biſhops Conſiſtory is called the Church.

up, These Canons are the commands *of the Church*, so rigorously urged, Who ever breaks a *Canon* especially in point of *Ceremony* is no dutifull sonne of the Church; Indeed, in point of Morality, Drinking, Swearing, Gaming, there is more indulgence. Nay, how many Bishops in *England* are there that have urged their owne private paper-injunctions as the commands of the Church, and proceeded against such as would not observe them, as disobedient or refractory against their Mother the Church? That Sir, upon the point there will appeare to be more Churches in *England* then one. For tell us, we beseech you, when the Church of *England* at *Norwich* forbade all prayer before and after Sermon, but onely in the words of the 55 Canon, forbad all preaching in the afternoons, all expounding of Catechisme, or Scriptures, the Church of *England* in *London* forbad none of these things; when the Church of *England* in *London* enjoyned rayling in Communion Tables, and all communicants to make their approaches thither, the Church of another Dioceſſe went further, and enjoyned setting of them Altarwise. And all these were the commands of the church of *England*. The transgression of any one of these, the omission of any other thing enjoyned, was condemned as disobedience to the church. Now how many churches of *England* were there at this time?

Note the sixteenth of the new Canons.

But you will play off all this as merriment with a *Ridiculum caput*. To deal with you therefore seriously; Becau'e you make so strange a thing of hearing of more churches of *England* then one, and distinguish so deeply between *Churches of* England, *and Churches*

Pag. 150.

in

in England, wee beſeech you conſider whither the Scripture doe not ſpeak as properly, when it ſpeaks of the *Churches of Judea* and of *Galatia*, as if it had ſaid the churches in *Judea*, and in *Galatia*? And what difference between Saint *Iohn* when hee writes to the *Church of Epheſus*, of *Laodicea*, and the church in *Sardis*, in *Thyatira*? Yet, we are not ridiculous enough: therefore the Remonſtrant will help the matter, and to make his jeere will corrupt our words. For whereas we had ſaid, if the bounds of *a Kingdome muſt needs be the limits of a Church*, Why are not *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland* all one church? to make it non-ſence, hee *adds of England*; are not *England*, *Scotland*, *and Ireland*, all *one Church of England*? Hee that made it, let him take it.

This diſcourſe of *Churches* of *England*, cannot end without a deſcent into the *Prelaticall and Anti-prelaticall Church*. We ſaid, We acknowledge no *Anti-prelaticall Church*. The *Remonſtrant* tels us if *wee make and condemne the Prelaticall Church*, what *ſhall be the other part of the contradiſtinction*. Our reply muſt be, that not we, but themſelves *make* the *Prelaticall Church*, wee doe but ſhew it; and we ſhew alſo the other part of the contradiſtinction which the Remonſtrant pleaſeth to call the *Antiprelaticall Church*. The Remonſtrant had upbrayded the Diviſions of that part, wee made our juſt defence, and therein declared that the Prelaticall party were the chiefe *Authours and Fomentors of thoſe diviſions*, which the Remonſtrant directly doth not deny, onely *bids us lay our hands upon our hearts, and* Pag. 151. *conſider whether our fomenting of ſo unjuſt and deep diſlikes of lawfull government have not been too much guilty of thoſe*

woful

wofull breaches. Sir, wee have considered it, and can before *the great heart-searching God plead not guilty*. The dislike of present Church government, which its own exorbitancy hath caused, we have not fomented, but have smothered our thoughts and griefs even untill this present, wherein the gracious hand of God hath inclined the heart of our gracious Soveraigne to call a Parliament, that hee and they might together consult of the pressures and grievances of his people, and conclude their removall. And now we *cannot*, *wee dare not* hold our peace, but declare our judgments, that if it shall seem good to our dread Sovereigne, and this Honourable Parliament, upon the many complaints brought in against Bishops and their Hierarchicall government, to remove the Hierarchie, This Act of State may appeare to all to be farre from sinne; this not being a government appointed by Christ, nor stamped with a *Jus Divinum*, though some will make that their protection.

Pag. 152. As One *that loves the peace of the Church*, *which wee* (you say) *are willing to trouble*, You aske after *the Bounders*, *&c.* Are you one that loves the peace of the Church? Wee pray of what Church? Sure that Church that is called *Prelaticall*, and no other, Where of we give you the boundaries and characters, which it seems please you not.

The bounders we shewed from your late Canons, which (say you) are too narrow: let them see to that that first made *them*. It is apparent, that the Canons made by Archbishops, Bishops, Deanes, and Archdeacons, in their Convocation, were never consented

to

to, much lesse confirmed by Parliament, and yet those are called the *Canons and Constitutions of the Church of England.* And therfore sure, though wee doe not exclude Bishops, Deanes, &c. from being members of the Church, yet *They* have excluded all the rest of the Nation.

For distinction wee brought bowing to the East, to Altars, &c. Now these (say you) are not *sufficient distinctions whereon to ground different Churches.* Yes Sir, if it be true that some have held, that the *outward Formes of worship, and ceremonies attending it* are the characters whereby one Church is differenced from another; but especially when such as will not practise these, shall be disclaimed by such as doe them, as none of the sonnes of the Church. When men shall be forced to subscribe to the practice of these things, or else they shall not bee admitted either into Livings, or Cures, (as in the instanced particulars wee have knowne it) then they make a difference of Churches. And who are the authours of such differences, but such as thus urge them? Next wee brought their Creed and instanced in Episcopacie by divine right: Hee replies, *Did ever man make this an Article of Faith?* Judge you by what Bishop *Hall* saith in his Episcopacie by Divine right part 2. pag. 47. *I am so confident of the Divine institution of the Majority of Bishops above Presbyters, that I dare boldly say, there are weighty points of faith that have not so strong ground in Scripture.* Is this to make it an article of Faith or no? And if not an Article of Faith, yet we are sure it is made an Article of the Church. For whereas by the orders of the Church of *England*, a Pag. 153.

man

man upon the admiſſion to his miniſtry is to be examined upon no other Articles then *the Articles of Religion eſtabliſhed in the Church of ENGLAND*, we have knowne more then one, whoſe firſt queſtion hath been, what doe you thinke of Epiſcopaice?

We added, abſolute & blind obedience to all commands of the Biſhop & Ordinaries: *you bid us bluſh.* But alas Sir we are not ſuch ſtrangers in *England*, nor your ſelfe neither, we believe, as not to know but that this hath been the common doctrine, and almoſt the ſole Doctrine preached by prelaticall men theſe many yeeres together. *And the blinder the better.* This we have heard, nor is it your limitation of the *Oath of canonicall obedience, in Omnibus licitis & honeſtis*, will help you: when ſome in ſtead of that have put in, *In omnibus ediitis & edendis?*

We added Election upon faith foreſeen. The Remonſtrant cries *What? nothing but groſſe untruthes. Is this the Doctrine of the* Biſhops *of* England, *have they not ſtrongly confuted it?* Yes ſure ſome few have, we know it. And doth not the Remonſtrant know that theſe few have been had in ſuſpicion, as *no true friends of the Church, much leſſe ſonnes of the Church, more puritanicall then prelaticall*, And we would none of them had ſaid, *They have beene labouring theſe twelve yeeres to get off the name of Puritan, and yet it will not doe*, and becauſe of this have beene printed *Tantum non in Epiſcopatu Puritani.* And the ſame Authour in an other booke after that, *Dico iterum iterumque dicam, Tantum non in Epiſcopatu Puritani.*

Pag. 153.

As

As for the Scriptures of Prelaticall men, we mentioned *Apocripha and unwritten traditions*: meaning that that generation lay as much weight almost upon traditions and Apocrypha, as upon a genuine text, and are more observant many of them of a custome, and tradition, then of the command of God. For Sacraments, we instanced, *a Baptisme of absolute necessity*, *an Eucharist* that must be administred upon an Altar. *What are these* (say you) *to the Church of England?* Nothing, but to the Prelaticall Church they are. *Call them if you will, Popish fooles, and addleheads*, that maintaine these opinions yet we know the number of them is not small, that have declined into these popish waies: we acknowledge also that these are men, if not that chiefly support the Prelacy, yet such as have beene chiefely suppoted and countenanced by it. We acknowledge there are many men learned and orthodox; that have in their judgments approved of Episcopall government; but what little incouragement these have had from the Prelates, especially, if laborious in their ministery, or any way opposing the Prelaticall innovation; in respect of the incouragements of those *popish fooles and addle-heads* as the Remonstrant cals them, a man may see with halfe an eye.

You demanded *what Christ the Prelaticall Church had?* Our answer is, *a Christ that hath given the same power of absolution to a Priest that himself hath*: which answer, you say, is *neere to blasphemy*: truely an opinion so neere to blasphemy can hardly be delivered in a language much distant from it: *but this* (you

Page 135. fay) *is a ſlanderous fiction: no Chriſtian Divine ever held Prieſts power of abſolution was any other then miniſteriall. If we know the man bring him forth that hee may be ſtoned.* Truely ſir, we knew the man that ſaid *the Prieſts power in abſolution was more then Miniſteriall, it was judiciary*; but he is paſt ſtoning, hee is dead: and we know another ſaid as much; but he ſung *Agags* ſong long agoe, *ſurely the bitterneſſe of death is paſt.* For when he was brought forth to be ſtoned, hee was reſcued by Prelaticall power, and his Sermon for which he was queſtioned, printed with licence, and in print preſented to the Conſiſtory. We know a third that in a Commencement did openly affirme Abſolution by a Prieſt to be abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation.

B *Montagu.*

Their Heaven we ſaid *was a receptacle of drunkards, ſweurers, adulterers*; and ſurely juſtly wee might ſay ſo, for when did your Conſiſtories, that pretend to have the keyes that open and ſhut Heaven, ſo ſhut the gates of Heaven againſt ſuch ſinners, as that a ſilver key could not open them againe? and though your charity keepe them in Heaven while they live ſuch, yet our charity ſhuts them not out of Heaven, if they did not die ſuch. But it may be you thinke confeſſion to a Prieſt, when they lie a dying ſhall infallibly ſave them, what ever their lives have beene; and thats the reaſon you ſlide by that prelaticall opinion and doe not queſtion us who hold it?

We profeſſe ſtill wee had rather goe on in our owne waies, then their's, and thinke it our duty to ſeparate from theſe waies and opinions, rather then embrace them: yet farre we are from any thoughts

of ſeparating from the Church of *England*; not did we ever intend to affixe thoſe *exoticall poſitions of unſound teachers* (as you call them) upon her: but on the faction who hath held promoted, countenanced them, and ſheltred themſelves all the while under the name of *the Church*. But if the Remonſtrant *hate theſe opinions as much as our ſelves*; we are glad, if he know others doe (becauſe he ſpeakes in the plurall) it is well. But wee would be glad to know in what *Pallace* that *Prelate* lives, that hath drawne out his aſſumed ſword of diſcipline againſt theſe *unſound teachers?* Or if he hath drawne, hath ſtrucke, or if ſtrucke, hath not ſtrucke with the backe; while the poore *Non conformiſts* hath beene ſlaine with the edge? or where hee lives that hath oppoſed theſe *exoticke poſitions* ſo farre as to hazzard the Archprelates froune in the oppoſition.

Having given ſufficient anſwer to the Remonſtrant, wee thought it not unfit to ſubjoyne ſome *Quares* about Epiſcopacy, for the Remonſtrant, (if he pleaſed) to anſwer. Which though he ſaith are made up of nothing *but ſpite and ſlaunder*: yet ſure- Page 156.
ly his owne conſcience tels him, there is much truth and ſtrength in them; elſe why doth he conclude we put ſo *much truſt* in them? (when we never told him ſo.) And why doth he not elſe apply himſelfe to anſwer? but like a *Socraticall* diſputant put off the queſtion with queſtion; knowing it is ſafer and eaſier to propound new queſtions, then to anſwer ours.

1. Your firſt *Quere* is, who ever *held the Lordſhips of Biſhops to be jure Divino? if no body, whether this be not*

to falsifie and slander? you might have considered that we spake not of the Lordships of Bishops *in abstracto*; but of Lordbishops *in concreto*: And who holds them to be *jure Divino*, is sufficiently knowne. But you aske *why it is a greater fault in one of our Doctours to hold the Lords day to stand by humane right* (and is there but one of our Doctors of that opinion?) *then it is for Master Calvine*, (whom for honours sake no doubt you name here as else where, seldome through your whole defence mentioning that worthy, but in some disgracefull passage.) But did Master *Calvin* ever hold Bishops to be *jure Divino*, or did Master *Calvine* ever as one of our Lord-bishops, who having received a letter from a Gentleman of his City, against the publication of the Booke of sports, returned no other answer then a sharpe censure of his zeale as giddy and indiscreet? Or did Master *Calvin* ever cry up Altars instead of Communion Tables, or Priests instead of Ministers? yet in these termes our Quere was propounded, and what ever Master *Calvin* doth in his institution, yet in his Comment upon Deuteronomy hee stands for the strict observation of the Lords day?

Quære 2. 2. *Whether it were any other than King James himselfe, of blessed memory, that said, No Bishop no King, &c.* King *James* of blessed memory, never spake this of Bishops by divine right, which are the Bishops now contended for. And if King *Iames* of blessed memory said, *no Bishop, no King:* it was not hee, but others that added, *no Ceremony, no Bishop*; nay some have risen higher, and said; *if neither Bishop, nor a King, how a God?*

3. *Whether*

3. *Whether since it is proved that Bishops are of more then meere humane ordinance, and have so long continued in the Christian Church to the great good of Church and State, it be not fit to establish them for ever, and to avoyd a dangerous motion of innovation?* sure if the Remonstrants words may goe for proofe it is proved, else not; that Bishops are of more then humane ordinance, and so long continuance, and how advantagious to the good of Church and State, *Acta probant*, and though motions of innovation may be dangerous, yet motions of Renovation are not. *Non est pudor ad meliora transire*, its no shame to amend. *Ambr.*

4. *Whether these Answerers have the wit or grace to understand the true meaning of the Divine right of Episcopacy?* We will not impute it to want of wit, or grace in the Remonstrant; but sure himselfe doth not clearely understand it, hee is so unconstant to his opinions: but whether the Remonstrant or his answerers understand the right of Episcopacy better, let the Readers to whose censure both in this controversie must stand or fall, determine: for our parts wee hope, wee understand what *jus divinum* meanes, but doe ingenuously confesse we have neither wit nor grace to understand the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy.

5. *Whether there be any question at all in the fifth question?* yes certainely, if the Remonstrant would not have baulked that which he knew not how to take away; the *distinction of Apostolicall right*, which say we, is either such as is founded upon the Acts, or Epistles of the Apostles, and is (we grant) divine: or such, as is not recorded in their writings, and is Page 157.

onely of things reported to be introduced into the Church the Apostles yet living. Now if the Remonstrant hold Episcopacy to be of Apostolicall right in the first sence, why doth he then grant us in expresse tearmes that in *originall authority of Scripture Bishops and Presbyters are originally the same ?* and why doth he in the same page make his retreat from the writings of the Apostles, to the monuments of succeeding times ? If he hold it in the latter sence, these two things yet remaine to be done : First, he is to prove that Bishops in a superiority of power over Presbyters, were introduced into the Church the Apostles yet living, and answer his friend *Cassander*, and our other testimonies produced to the contrary. Secondly, to prove, that such things may be of Divine right, whereof no record is found in Divine writings.

Def.p.47.

6. *Whether Master Beza have not heard soundly of his distinction of the three kinds of Episcopacy in the full and learned answer of Soravia ?* Yes, and *Soravia*, and others that have borrowed from him, have heard as soundly of their defences of Episcopacy, both by domesticke and forreine Divines, who have sufficiently declared how well our *story of the Painter suits with your Discipline :* but if that please you not, we can fit you with an other of the Painter, mentioned in *Plutarch*; who having drawne a cocke very unskilfully and rudely, could not indure any cocke to stand within view, for feare of discovering the deformity of his picture : So our Bishops having drawne a forme and line of government, which they propose to the world as divine; will not indure

the

the true divine government to come in view, for feare of diſcovering the irregularity of theirs.

7. *Whether it were not fit that we alſo ſhould ſpeake as the ancient Fathers did?* Sir, by your leave it is ſafe to ſpeake in the language the Scripture ſpeakes, but you ſhould have done well to have ſpoken to the reaſon upon which our Quere was grounded, and what further reaſons we then had, and ſtill have to make this Quere may appeare by what wee have ſayd before in vindicating *Timothy* and *Titus* from ſuch like objections. Page 158.

8. *Whether Presbyters can without ſinne arrogate unto themſelves the exerciſe of the power of publike Church-government, &c.* to ſay nothing what honour here you give to your *deare Siſter-Churches*: Our anſwer is, Yes they may take the exerciſe of that power without *ſinne*, though not without *danger*, if your High-Commiſſion were ſtanding. For our Saviour Chriſt when he gave to *Peter* the promiſe of the keyes, made in one undiſtinguiſhable act, a donation of the power both of preaching and governing; and therefore if Presbyters may without ſin publickly exerciſe the one by vertue of that donation, they may by the ſame charter as warrantably exerciſe the other. The laſt branch of your quere; *Whether any Father or Doctor till this age held that Presbyters were ſucceſſors to the Apoſtles? &c.* We wonder that any man who hath but the repute of learning ſhould make ſuch a quere. And for the anſwer, we refer you to what we have ſaid before in this booke.

9. *Whether ever any Biſhops aſſumed to themſelves power temporall to be Barons? &c.* Our anſwer is:

You

You ſhew better writts for your temporalties, then you have done yet for your ſpiritualties. And our quære was directed to ſhew the ſpirituall power of Biſhops to be of more dangerous conſequence then their temporall; to which purpoſe we produced five reaſons, which wee perſwade our ſelves you ſcarcely read over (for in the third there is a fault in the printing, which had you ſeene, your charity would ſcarce have let paſſe without an obſervation) which remaining unanſwered, wee conclude as before; *it concernes all thoſe that have ſpirituall eyes, to endeavour to abrogate their ſpirituall uſurpations as well as their temporall.* As for the latter part of this Quere, it is a begging of the whole diſpute, *Et eadem facilitate rejicitur, quâ affirmatur.*

10. *Whether the anſwerers have not juſt cauſe to be aſhamed of patronizing a noted hereticke Aerius, &c.* To this we anſwer: That if *Aerius* was accounted an heretique for denying Biſhops to be all one with Presbyters by divine right, we are not aſhamed to patronize him, till you have anſwered our allegations for his defence which are brought in this quere, and in divers places in this Booke. But you could not be ſo ignorant but to know how *Bellarmine* and divers others doe ſay, That *Aerius* was accounted an hereticke, not for denying the inequality of Biſhops and Presbyters by Scripture, but by the Canons of the Church. But wee wonder how we eſcaped the brand of the hereſie of the *Audiani*, who by the ſame *Epiphanius* are called heretiques (though men of a blameleſſe converſation) becauſe they did not without juſt cauſe) freely and boldly reprove

prove the vices of the Biſhops of their daies.

11. *Whether the great apoſtacy of the Church of Rome doe, or did conſiſt in the maintaining the order of government ſet by the Apoſtles themſelves, &c.* Sure no: wee never ſayd, nor thought it. But that a great part of *the Apoſtacy* of the Church of Rome conſiſted in ſwarving from the diſcipline of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, as well as from the doctrine and ſetting up and maintaining a new *Hierarchicall forme*, which cannot enter into our hearts to thinke the Apoſtles did ever ſet up: and which the moſt part of the Churches in the Chriſtian World, that are profeſſedly oppoſite unto the Church of Rome doe oppoſe, as much as they doe *Rome* it ſelfe; though you beare the Reader in hand, *they all maintaine it no leſſe conſtantly then Rome it ſelfe doth*; which no man but he that hath captivated reaſon, & modeſty to his cauſe, and will, would have ſo confidently and untruly ſpoken. Once againe let us aske you, whether by this bould ſpeech all the reformed Churches of Chriſt be not now ſhut out of the number of Churches? Page 160.

12. *Whether if Epiſcopacy be (through the munificence of good Princes) honoured with a title of dignity, &c. it to be ever the more declined?*

Since the time that Epiſcopacy has bin honored with dignity, and revenues, the office hath not bin *declined*; but the Biſhops themſelves haue bin *declining*. Yet our Quere was not whether this were a ground of *declining* the place, but rather of *deſiring* the place. As for our crying up the *Presbytery*, becauſe wee hope to carry ſome ſway in

it. We acknowledge our selves unworthy to beare any part in it; but we heartily desire that Christ may rule, and wee shall most willingly subject our selves to his government.

13. *Whether there bee no other apparent causes to be given for the encrease of popery and superstition in the Kingdome, besides Episcopacy (which hath strongly laboured to oppose it) &c.* We deny not but there may have bin other causes, but none so *apparant* as Episcopacy. But whereas in a parenthesis which you might well have left out without any detriment either to your sense or the truth, you say that, *Episcopacy hath strongly laboured to oppose* popery: we answer *Quid verba audimus cum facta videmus?* you aske againe *whether the multitude of Sects* (you should have added which the tyranny of Bishops hath made,) *And professed slovenlinesse in Gods service have not bin guilty of the encrease of prophaneness.* We answer againe, not so much as the forbidding of preaching and Catechising, as the countenancing of sports on the Lords day, as the scandalous lives of too too many episcopall men, and the libertinisme of the Bishops houses and Courts.

14. Your 14. Quere consists of a *Paradox*, and a *Solœcisme*. *A Paradox* in saying, *That all Churches throughout the whole Christian world have ever observed, and doe constantly and uniformely observe and maintaine* Episcopall government. When as you know all your *deare sisters* of whom you professe a tender care, doe disclaime it. Of a *Bull* and *solœcisme* in saying *That all Christian Churches doe constantly and uniformely observe it.* And yet confessing, that there

there are *leſſe noble Churches* that conforme not unto it.

15. In your next *Quere* you contradict your ſelfe and the truth as a *ſelfe confounded man.* For here you ſay, *That the name of Biſhop hath bin for this* 1600 *yeares appropriated (in a plaine contradiſtinction) to the governours of the Church.* But page 48 where we bring *Irenæus* calling *Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus*, &c. Biſhops of Rome Presbyters, And others alſo uſing the name ἀδιαφόρως; You cry outwith a loud voyce, *Is this all? that your triſling may appeare to all the World. Name but any one of our writers, who have hitherto ſtood up in the cauſe of Epiſcopacy, that have not granted and proclaimed this which you contend for.* In the latter end of this quere, you thinke to ſtop our mouthes with *Balaams wages*, and demand. *Whether if we will allow you to be Biſhops, all will not be well?* Wee are *ſcripture Biſhops* without your *allowance.* As for to be *Hierarchicall Biſhops*, ſince God will not *allow* it, we care not for your *allowance.* But what *Patent* or *Monopoly* have you among all the multitude of late *Projectors* obtained, that without your allowance a *Presbyter* may not be admitted into a Biſhoprick?

16. To your laſt *Quere* we anſwer. That if *God had ſet your epiſcopall government in his Church*; wee know *it could not bee lawfull for us to deny ſubjection unto it.* But we have proved the contrary in this diſcourſe. Neither have *the Lawes of this land ſo firmely eſtabliſhed it*; but that it may be repealed by the ſame Lawes, and ſuffer *a juſt period* for its *matchleſſe pride*, and *inſufferable oppreſſions.* Which for the preſent we perceive is out of feare a little abated, and that

makes you *aske*; *Whether it were not most lawfull and just to punish our presumption and disobedience, &c.* Time was when *the High commission* and other *Episcopall Courts* would have made *both our eares more then tingle* for such a question without enquiring either the *lawfulnesse and justice of it.*

Thus we have answered his 16. Queries, but before we end our booke, we cannot but take notice of what the Remonstrant addes in the conclusion. For there he tells us, *That he hopes he hath given a sufficient answer to our bold and unjust demands*: And yet notwithstanding he doth not vouchsafe to give any answer at all, but only propounds new questions, insteed of answers: which if the Reader will conceive a *sufficient way of answering*; we doubt not but we shall quickly give satisfaction to all that ever hath bin written for Episcopall government, either by *Bishop Bilson*, *Bishop Downham*, *Bishop Hall*, or any other whatsoever.

To all the Postscripts.

Wee will not create trouble to the Reader, by a reiterated justification of our sincerity, though it be againe prodigiously wounded. Here is much cry, and little wooll. Hee cannot deny what in our *Postscript* we have proved to be the practises of Prelates, ever since *Austins* erection of the See of *Canterbury*, onely first hee falsely tells us, *that wee have borrowed a great part of it out of Sions plea.* But if that Author hath collected any of the same Stories (which yet wee know not) out of the Chronicles,

why

Why should we be thought to have borrowed them from him, (whom wee durst not for feare of the *Prelates* keepe in our studies) rather then from the Chronicles themselves?

Secondly he answers, *That they were popish Bishops, limmes of that body whose head we abjure, &c.* But Sr you know that in *Henry* the eights time, when this head abjured, the *Body* of popery still remained. This *Body* of popery (comprehended in six Articles) was called *a whip of six strings*. And you with all your Rhetoricke will hardly perswade the people, but that they have bin lashed for these many yeares with *a whip of six and twenty strings*. Have not most of these denied this *Head* to be *Antichrist*? And *that if wise men had the handling of it, we might be reconciled unto it*? Hath not one of their abettors written, *that the Religion of the Church of Rome is not onely a possible, but a safe way to Heaven*? What then will it availe to say that our Bishops and they have different heads?

Thirdly, he answers, That *a charitable man might have made a longer Catalogue of the good fruites of our Episcopacy*, and reckons up a multitude of their good deeds, many whereof, I ould wee *wipe our eyes* never so much, wee feare wee should not see, and the rest which are in any kind visible, will not, if weighed in a just ballance, beare any proportion, to all those unnaturall fruits mentioned in our *Postscript*.

In his close he tells us, *That the Bishops foote hath bin in our booke, which is quite spoiled by his just confutation*. We confesse truly the Bishops foote hath left much dirt behinde it; but could many hundreds

of godly Miniſters, have as eaſily got the *Greene Wax* and *Red Wax* of the Biſhops out of their mouthes with which they have bin a long time ſtopped, As we have wiped away the dirt that hath bin throwne upon our booke; The Church of *England* had never made ſo many ſad complaints, and preſented ſo many dolefull petitions unto the high and ſupreme Court of Juſtice.

2. His ſecond *Poſtſcript* is an advertiſement to the Reader, for the vindication of the credit of the perſon of Doctor *Hall*, and his *Epiſcopacy by divine right*, from the cenſure which Doctor *Voetius* is reported to have paſſed upon them both. True it is, there was tendred to us a juſtification of what that *angry Pamphlet* (as he calls it) had publiſhed to the world. But becauſe wee found that it would deeply reflect upon the credit of Doctor *Hall*, and that in a language more diſgracefull then that was before ſaid, wee refuſed to inſert it. Our buſineſſe is with a *nameleſſe Remonſtrant*, not with the *undervaluation* of any mans perſon in particular. If hee pleaſe to call for it, he may have it.

His third *Poſtſcript* brings in the judgement of *Sculletus* to make the World believe that his new opinion of Epiſcopacy by divine right is not deſtitute of Patrons in the reformed Churches. But what is one *Sculletus* to the many hundred learned men amongſt them of a contrary judgement? We might here retort upon our Remonſtrant, that he ſaith concerning the moderator of *Geneva* page 138. *You tell me of the moderator of* Geneva *as if all the Church of God were included in thoſe ſtrait walls*. We could have tranſlated

tranſlated *Voetius* his *Theſes* for the juſtification of lay Elders both out of Scripture and antiquity. But for brevity ſake wee will content our ſelves with what that learned *Rivet* ſpake (when theſe two Treatiſes of *Scultetus* were ſhewed to him by a great *Prelate* amongſt us, and his judgement required) *Hæc omnia jamdudum ſunt protrita & profligata.* This was related to us by Doctor *Twiſſe*, who had it from Doctor *Rivet* himſelfe.

FINIS.

The Printer to the Reader.

Courteous Reader,

WE cannot but confeſſe, that the crouding in of many little Pamphlets into the Preſſe hath for many weeks detained this Book, to the great grief of the Authors: Wee deſire thee to correct with thy pen theſe following *Errata*, and to cover the leſſer faults with thy Charity.

PAge 12 line 11 *dele* more to be read line 18 read or. p 14 l 5 *deeſt* Although. l 30 r obtain. p 18 d *Zanchy* and *Caſſander* out of the margent. p 21 l 6 r *inſtruct oribus*. p 26 l 17 next appointed adde, a hint thereof we have *Acts* 3. 1. p 28 l 17 r *Presbyters* for *Prieſts*. l 18 for not r once. p 29 l 27 d becauſe. p 38 l 12 d for our part. l 31 r time. p 42 l pen. r Reformed Proteſtant Churches. p 36 l 18 r Their. p 64 l 24 r *Presbyteris*. p 74 l 30 At That make a comma. p 81 l ult r Common. p 84 r haſty. p 86 l 15 r Contradiction. p 92 l 25 for are r have been p 93 l 16 r *admiſimus*. p 96 l 14 r *Leo*. p 111 l 31 r proved. p 112 l 27 r pleaſe. p 113 l 18 r proofs for proceſſe. p 114 l 16 for promiſe r. premiſe p 115 l 21 for alone r along. p 118 l 8 r office for worke. p 126 l 24 make a comma at of. p 127 l 21 r of for as. p 129 l 14 r *Cappellus*. p 132 l 29 to *Dowhamum*, adde *Epiſcopacie by Divine Right*. p 135 l 11 next to Thirdly adde is there. p 136 l 26 adde The in the beginning of the line p 159 l 27 r *Campian*. p 160 l 31 for were you, and for your r we. p 174 l 11 dele particular. p 175 l 6 dele Call.